

SENATE—Tuesday, November 17, 1981

(Legislative day of Monday, November 2, 1981)

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The presence of Reverend Sorrell to deliver the prayer was requested by Senator MATHIAS.

PRAYER

The Reverend Doctor Harold W. Sorrell, Jr., pastor, Clinton Baptist Church, Clinton, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Father, we approach Thee with bowed heads and humble hearts. Thou art powerful and yet compassionate. Thou art all-wise and yet understanding of the limited knowledge of Thy creatures. Thou art cosmic in vision and yet able to see the needs of the most humble individual. Thou art sovereign over all of creation and yet willing to give humans a freedom of choice.

Unto Thy human creature hast Thou given the right to govern. Unto us hast Thou given a free nation in which to find fulfillment of our dreams and aspirations. Unto us hast Thou given elected officials to serve as ministers of God to us for good. Thus we heed the call of Paul not to fear such but to subject ourselves to their leadership.

Grant that these Senators who gather here on this Tuesday might be given clear minds and wise understanding. Let Thy wisdom be expressed through these Thy ministers of government, that we who follow their leadership might find good in life.

In the name above all names, we pray. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of the Senate be approved to date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, according to my notes, after the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIER) will be recognized on a special order, to be followed by a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend more than 20 minutes, in

which Senators may speak for not more than 3 minutes each.

At the close of morning business, as ordered, the Senate will resume the consideration of H.R. 4169, the State-Justice-Commerce appropriations bill.

I inquire whether the Chair's records coincide with the program I have just outlined.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ARMSTRONG). The majority leader is correct.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

LEGISLATIVE SCHEDULE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, in addition to the State-Justice-Commerce appropriations bill today, there is at least one other appropriations bill that I hope we might take up, and that is the Foreign Assistance appropriations bill. I believe it might not take a great deal of time to finish that measure. I hope the minority leader might consider the possibility of approving proceeding to that measure by temporarily laying aside the State-Justice-Commerce measure at some point in the day and taking up that appropriations bill.

It is also my understanding that Senators on both sides of the aisle may have caucuses around the noon hour today. If the schedule will permit—and I hope it will—it will be the intention of the leadership to have the Senate stand in recess during that time, since the caucuses by both parties are semiofficial in nature and often result in expediting the proceedings of the Senate, and I believe that is usually a good investment of the time of the Senate.

It is not expected that the Senate will be in very late today, although that will be determined in large part by how much progress we can make or how difficult it is to achieve progress.

Mr. President, the continuing resolution on appropriations was received in the Senate Chamber last evening and has been referred to the Committee on Appropriations. It is my understanding that the Appropriations Committee will begin considering that matter today and perhaps even report a resolution to the Senate tonight. If that is the case, I will once again approach the minority leader on the possibility of waiving the rule impediment that would prevent its earlier consideration and propose to take it up tomorrow, if it is available tomorrow.

There is another matter, the so-called waiver package, Joint Resolution 115, dealing with the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline project. It had been my hope that it might be taken up either today or tomorrow. I urge Senators, however, to consider that we must take up that matter sometime this week. It is highly privileged, by the terms of the statute. Later

today, I hope to have another announcement to make about when that matter will be scheduled. I remind Senators that there is a statutory time with respect to the consideration of that measure.

It is expected that on Friday we will continue with other legislative items, perhaps appropriation bills, perhaps even a conference report on the continuing resolution. The continuing resolution expires, by its terms, at midnight on November 20. It is imperative, of course, that we deal with that matter in advance of that time.

I must repeat the admonition I made on Friday and repeated yesterday—that there is a strong probability of a Saturday session, perhaps even a Sunday session.

Mr. President, the Senate will be in session Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week. I expect that we will have legislative business to perform during those days and that we will have votes. Senators are on notice, as they have been for some months, that only Thursday and Friday are set aside for the Thanksgiving recess. I think that is essential in view of the work that is yet to be done by the Senate.

I will try to arrange, with the cooperation of the distinguished minority leader, to abbreviate the business of the Senate on Wednesday, so that it will be possible for Members to catch airplanes, especially those who live some distance from the Federal city. I estimate that we will not have a very busy schedule on Wednesday afternoon, after about 3 o'clock.

Mr. President, I do not believe I have any other announcements I can make today that will be of particular interest to the Senate, until later in this day at least.

Therefore, I am prepared to yield to any Senator seeking recognition or, if there are none, to yield the control of my remaining time to the distinguished minority leader.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his outline of the program.

I have no need for my time at this point.

SENATOR NUNN ON NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the control of nuclear weaponry has become a matter of increasing urgency and difficulty at several different levels. At the level of strategic intercontinental delivery systems, the administration has taken the position that the SALT II

agreement was "fatally flawed," and America must rebuild her strategic systems in order to negotiate a new treaty from a position of greater strength. The goal of the new negotiations is said to be arms "reduction," rather than "limitation."

There are serious problems with this approach. First, the strategic weapons recommendations made by the administration have been termed "interim" in nature. The decision to build a B-1 will cost so much over the next 5 years that the present Strategic Air Commander has stated the vital Stealth program will be stretched out. We simply cannot afford two new bombers at once. Furthermore, the decision to harden existing Titan and Minuteman silos, to place the MX missiles in them, does nothing to reduce the vulnerability of our ICBM force to Soviet attack.

Indeed, the administration's program calls for early retirement of portions of our B-52 and ICBM force, and may well make us more vulnerable in the mid-1980's than we would have been under the program of the previous administration. The net result of these decisions, decisions dictated by severe budget constraints rather than defense needs, is that the position of greater strength looks more and more illusory. Does this mean that we will delay the initiation of strategic arms talks with the Soviet Union indefinitely? Apparently not, since administration officials are saying that such talks will begin sometime next spring.

The second difficulty relates to the upcoming negotiations with the Soviets on the question of nuclear weapons in the European theater. It is essential that the American position in those negotiations appears serious and credible since the pressure is mounting on European governments to back off from their commitment to deploy such weapons in 1983. Our NATO partners expect us to negotiate the TNF question within the overall strategic arms framework. Indeed, Secretary Haig signed a communique with the other NATO defense ministers on May 5, 1981, which stated that the "... allies welcome the intention of the United States to begin negotiations with the Soviet Union on theater nuclear forces arms control within the SALT framework by the end of the year."

The problem here is that the administration, while rejecting SALT II, has not developed any of its own concrete arms reduction proposals around which the Alliance could rally. The danger exists, therefore, that the Soviets are being handed an opportunity to submit attractive proposals this year which could divide the Alliance and accelerate European tendencies to repudiate American leadership on the TNF deployment. The situation has been needlessly exacerbated by recent assertions that a nuclear conflict may be plausibly limited to European soil. Needless to say, such statements make implementation of the TNF deployment schedule more difficult. They put us in a more difficult position in the

upcoming negotiations. They provide the Soviets with propaganda opportunities—opportunities which they skillfully exploit across Europe—to posture as genuine proponents of arm control. All that is occurring as they continue to deploy their SS-20 medium range ballistic missiles at the rate of one a week—making the imbalance of nuclear forces continually worse.

A third difficulty is that technological developments will make the successful conclusion of verifiable arms control agreements more difficult as time goes on. For example, U.S. cruise missile deployments introduce new elements of uncertainty into the equation, and the eventual production and deployment of similar Soviet weaponry will compound the uncertainties.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia, Senator NUNN, a highly respected Member of this body on defense issues, has made a valuable contribution to the discussion of these matters in a guest editorial published in the November 12, 1981, edition of the Washington Post. He suggests that institutional changes within the U.S. Government are needed in order to bring more coherence and consistency to American arms control efforts over time. He points out that more coordination is needed between Defense Department decisionmakers and administration arms controllers. Indeed, without more attention to this problem, our efforts to build a strong consensus within NATO on these matters may be doomed to failure.

In addition to these matters, however, Senator NUNN identifies with great clarity a problem now developing as a result of the proliferation of nuclear weapons technology: The possibility of nuclear weapons use by irresponsible parties to blackmail the West, to conduct nuclear terrorism, or even to precipitate a nuclear exchange between the superpowers. Senator NUNN surmises that the number of nuclear-armed nation states could grow from 6 to 20 by the end of this century. He speculates on a number of frightening, but certainly plausible, scenarios in which these weapons could plunge the world into a nuclear crisis, whether through detonations of unknown origin or through outright blackmail.

Thus, he points out that arms reduction or limitation principles must now be supplemented by a new concept—to control the potential use of such weapons in a crisis—so-called crisis-stability. Since there is no international mechanism to decisively contain these new possibilities of nuclear war, it seems clear that the United States and the Soviet Union bear a responsibility to work together on this crisis-management problem. Obviously, the problem is but a subset of the whole question of nuclear arms control arrangements which must be developed by the superpowers. It is one more important reason why the United States must make renewed efforts to develop, in detail, its arms control pol-

icies as soon as possible and to initiate serious negotiations with the Soviets.

I commend Senator NUNN for his continuing contributions to the debate on our Nation's defense posture and congratulate him for this thought-provoking article. I commend my colleagues' attention to it and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 12, 1981]

ARMS CONTROL: WHAT WE SHOULD DO

(By SAM NUNN)

America's arms control goals have been vague and poorly understood by the public. Our tactics have been short-term, and our strategy ambiguous. Our patience at the negotiating table has been short-lived. Our timing has too often been driven by election considerations and our expectations have swung between euphoria and despair.

Three arms control treaties with the Soviet Union have been signed (by presidents Nixon, Ford and Carter) but have not been ratified by the Senate. This may demonstrate that our "separation of powers" is alive and well, but it also raises serious questions as to whether any American president can conclude an arms control treaty any more.

THE SETTING

The United States is now abiding (without formal agreement) by a SALT treaty that President Reagan himself declared "fatally flawed." While awaiting leverage from newly announced but as yet unapproved strategic programs, we are not renegotiating this unratified treaty. Testimony indicates it will be at least the late 1980s before any new strategic programs close the "window of vulnerability" and bring us back to "parity." Several key parts of the recently announced strategic program, which are not yet well-defined, will have major arms control implications.

We are about to begin negotiations with the Soviets on tactical nuclear weapons, an area in which the United States has little leverage and NATO is at a pronounced military disadvantage. These negotiations provide the Soviet Union a considerable opportunity to prevent the long overdue NATO tactical nuclear force modernization. They also create an increasingly unrealistic separation between strategic and theater nuclear weapons and allow the Soviets skillfully to manipulate growing European skepticism of American leadership.

Under these circumstances, should we be puzzled when we look over our shoulder and our allies aren't following our lead? They don't know where we're going. Do we? Whether we like it or not, our arms control efforts and NATO's future are now linked. A clear, consistent arms control approach that enjoys the support of Congress and the American people is a national security imperative.

CONTINUITY

If the American position on arms control is to have more credibility with our allies, our adversaries and the American people, we must bring some continuity to our process for formulating and executing arms control policy and integrating it with military policies. We must develop a clear set of long-term goals, objectives and priorities that can be understood by the public, our allies and, ideally, even our adversaries.

Procedures within our government must be developed to ensure that strategic weapons programs and arms control measures mesh

together better. We can no longer separate the two functions, giving civilians the job of controlling arms and the military the job of procuring weapons. U.S. military planners must have a greater input in shaping our arms control objectives so that arms control measures can also be treated as viable instruments for attaining required security objectives.

For more than a decade, the Soviets have had essentially the same people negotiating SALT. During that same period, the United States has had six chief negotiators and the major support staff has been changed many times. Why shouldn't the Soviets be confident they can wait out the Americans? Why shouldn't our allies and our adversaries believe that our patience and our horizons are limited in the arms control arena?

One way to improve arms control continuity would be to upgrade substantially the current General Advisory Committee on Arms Control. The present committee is co-located with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and, rightly or wrongly, is viewed as an adjunct of that agency. We should consider creating a bipartisan presidential commission to be the board of directors for our arms control efforts.

The commission would be appointed by the president and confirmed by the Senate for overlapping terms long enough to give it independence and continuity. It could not and should not supersede the constitutional prerogatives of the executive branch to negotiate, and the Senate to ratify, treaties. It could, however, be asked to bring some coherence to our arms control philosophy and implementation. Reporting directly to the president, the board should have a broad charter to consider arms control under the rubric of overall national security and foreign policy.

It could provide a publicly respected review board to:

- Help formulate long- and short-term arms control objectives, goals and priorities consistent with our national security and our defense policies;

- Monitor negotiations; and

- Keep the American public informed of the goals, objectives and priorities of our arms control efforts in a way that can be separated from partisan political considerations.

STABILITY

The U.S. arms control process has had a narrow scope that undermines its potential positive impact in military terms and in international opinion. Over the last decade, most of our arms control effort has been directed at limiting the size of nuclear arsenals rather than avoiding or limiting the potential use of nuclear weapons in crises—so-called "crisis-stability." We hope to reduce the number of weapons in the long run, but reductions in numbers do not automatically or necessarily increase crisis stability. We hope to save money with a sound arms control agreement, but an even larger strategic budget would be well worth the money if the result were the reduced likelihood of nuclear war. With thousands of nuclear warheads available to each side, control of their use in crises is more important than reduction of numbers, cost or technological development.

We must begin to think about arms control initiatives that will address crisis stability.

How would the Russians react if a low-flying aircraft with U.S. markings delivered a nuclear device on one of their cities? Do they have the capability to determine the true origin of the aircraft? Would stunned and angry Russians react calmly and cautiously or would they draw immediate conclusions and launch a nuclear attack against America? How would we react if a nuclear device ex-

ploded in a ship of unknown origin in San Francisco harbor and obliterated the city? Will we sit idly by while the possibilities grow in the years ahead that a fanatical leader may attempt to rid the world of the superpowers by pulling a Third World trigger?

Are these unreal science fiction fantasies or is there a growing possibility of a third-party or terrorist use of nuclear weapons? At my request last spring, Gen. Richard Ellis, then commander of the Strategic Air Command, undertook the evaluation of the possibility of a third party triggering a superpower nuclear exchange under a variety of scenarios. Unfortunately, this evaluation showed that there are real and developing dangers in this area.

Do the U.S.S.R. and the United States have a mutual interest in preventing a Third World trigger or a terrorist use of nuclear weapons? Should both nations have a mutual interest in working together to be able immediately to identify the source of a nuclear strike from a third country or from a terrorist attack? Can arms control efforts be made relevant to the growing dangers of this type of nuclear catalyst?

The point is not to frighten, but to stimulate the best minds in both the United States and the Soviet Union to think soberly about the future potential for destruction facing the world. There are an increasing number of scenarios that could precipitate the outbreak of nuclear war that neither side anticipated or intended. By 1990, our government believes that more than 20 nations may have the industrial capability to build nuclear weapons. Terrorist possession of nuclear warheads in the future cannot be dismissed. Several nations are now also developing rockets for "commercial purposes." The simple fact is that we really don't have an international framework or mechanism for quickly and decisively controlling or containing these possibilities. In a world growing more dangerous with proliferation of nuclear weapons and delivery systems, the United States and the Soviet Union, as well as other nuclear powers, have growing reason to work together to prevent nuclear war.

U.S.-SOVIET COOPERATION

While there is still time, serious thought should be given by ourselves and the Russians to our possible mutual interest in establishing a military crisis control center for the monitoring and containment of nuclear weapons used by third parties or terrorist groups. This could take the form of joint U.S.-Soviet information-sharing combined with a multinational center for crisis management. A precedent for this type of effort can be found in the four-power Berlin center for movement of aircraft in the Berlin corridors.

The crisis management group could be a permanent standing team of highly qualified civilian and military personnel, in full operation 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, with access to the top political and military leadership. Its purpose would be to provide a mechanism that gives each side more confidence in the facts during a nuclear crisis. It would afford the leaders of both nations a better chance to determine, independently and jointly, the origin and parties responsible for any explosion of nuclear weapons. It has the potential for encouraging cooperation and building confidence between the superpowers, even when political relations are at a low ebb. These steps could contribute to crisis stability. They could also add a significant degree of deterrence to third-country or terrorist attempts to light the nuclear bonfire.

This will not be a simple task completed quickly, but the discussions and negotiations should begin. These negotiations could be broadened to address other mutual arms con-

trol steps, such as confidence-building measures to enhance verification, strengthening the U.S.-Soviet hot line, as well as reducing the vulnerabilities of command, control and communications of both nations. We could also begin discussions on a possible nuclear weapons deployment agreement that would lengthen the warning time both nations would have of a nuclear attack.

The nuclear powers must begin to improve our capacity to control a nuclear crisis—regardless of origin. Our nation must adopt clear goals that establish a foundation for arms control that has long-term continuity and less vulnerability to domestic partisan politics. We must find an arms control policy we can live with.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I yield to Mr. PROXMIER any of my time he may wish to use.

Mr. PROXMIER. I thank my good friend, the minority leader.

Mr. President, as I understand it, I have a special order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I shall use part of the time of the distinguished minority leader and then I shall use my regular time. I do not think I will use more than 15 minutes.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, in view of this statement, I yield back my time remaining under the standing order.

LET US NOT GIVE UP ON BALANCING THE FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, is inflation still the major economic problem in this country? The answer is of course, yes, indeed. We continue to suffer the most serious inflation we have ever endured. It has continued ever since 1939, 42 long years, by far the longest continuous inflation in American history.

Wholesale prices have risen by more than 600 percent, making this inflation by far the severest the Nation has ever suffered. It has continued right through three wars and the end of those wars.

This inflation has been so virulent that even the massive release of resources after World War II, the Korean war, and the Vietnam war did not reverse, as the end of wars always had in the past, the relentless rise of prices.

Indeed, it has continued right through recessions, including the 1974-75 economic downturn, the worst recession since the Great Depression, but prices continued to march right uphill, and the inflation continues now through another recession, with unemployment at 8 percent and rising, with bankruptcies nearing record levels, with an enormous surplus of unused capacity and idle resources. Prices continue their steady climb.

And thanks very largely to America's predominant leadership in the free world this inflation has become international. It plagues every free market economy in the world and has done so for decades. And this represents a serious and damaging spinoff threatening the military strength of the free world.

INFLATION NO. 1 PROBLEM

Yes, indeed, price rises have moderated some under the pressure of the current recession. But for anyone with any sense of perspective inflation, rampaging inflation, remains as our No. 1, our major economic problem. We cannot neglect inflation as the No. 1 priority of our economic policies.

Because inflation remains our predominant economic problem, we must not give up on the basic anti-inflation economic policies because we now find ourselves in a serious and growing recession. Let me be specific: that means we should not abandon our determination to cut spending and to balance the budget.

Mr. President, in the last few weeks the rate of interest has been falling. The prime rate has fallen from 21 percent to below 17 percent. Interest rates on Treasury bills have come down rapidly. The Federal Reserve Board has sharply reduced the rediscount rate and seems poised to cut it again. Mortgage interest rates remain stubbornly and painfully high but may start coming down soon. But again, Mr. President, for anyone with any sense of perspective, interest rates remain outrageously high by any historical standard. And what is worse, all of us know that as soon as the economy recovers those interest rates will resume their climb right back to the paralyzing levels that have knocked the housing industry flat on its back and driven the automobile industry into the worst economic times in many years.

Mr. President, let us recognize the nature of this recession. This is an inflation-induced recession. To recover from the recession we should not deepen the inflation. We should slow it down.

HIGH INTEREST RATES

So once again because high interest rates remain as the cruel cutting edge of inflation we must follow policies that will bring them down and keep them down to the historic levels that have throughout virtually all of our history enabled this country to grow and prosper unmatched by any other country in the world.

Again let me be specific: That means we should not abandon our determination to cut Federal spending and balance the budget. It means we should get the Federal Government out of the credit markets by stopping net off budget borrowing, and that brings me Mr. President, to my regular countdown. We now have 317 days before the expiration of the \$1.79 trillion debt limit on September 30, 1982. We should not raise that debt limit again.

We should use the 10½ months that we have and the roughly \$75 billion leeway we have remaining to assure the financial markets that we will not push the debt limit any higher. This is it. The Federal Government will not sink further into debt.

Is such a course practical with 8½ million Americans out of work? Absolutely, and here is why: Most of those

Americans are out of work because enormous Government borrowing has driven interest rates so high that consumers and businesses simply cannot afford to borrow money.

We suffer a credit depression. Why do we have 2 million fewer jobs in home-building than demand for homes should support?

Because with mortgage rates about 15 percent, or more, we have priced more than 1 million families right out of the housing market. For a typical American family buying a new home, monthly payments would exceed an absolutely prohibitive \$1,000, 80 percent of which is interest. With reasonable interest rates the typical monthly payments could fall to \$600 from \$1,000 and we would easily have another 1 million housing starts and 2 million additional jobs. Similarly in automobiles, farm equipment, in a vast variety of small business, high interest rates have stopped business cold.

CUT INTEREST RATES—FOR MORE JOBS

Reduce interest rates and we put America back to work. And how do we reduce interest rates? We reduce the mammoth rate of Federal Government borrowing. We cut the deficit and balance the budget. We yank the Federal Government out of net off-budget borrowing. And how do we accomplish that? We observe the debt limit and stop right where it is now.

Mr. President, hard as it may be to accept the argument, we will actually put more Americans to work if we reduce spending and balance the budget than if we follow any other economic policy.

ADMINISTRATION SURRENDERS

The Reagan administration has started out on both the right and the wrong path in putting this country back to work. For the first time in 50 years we have an administration that has, in fact, won congressional action to reduce Federal spending and yet the administration has now officially given up on any effort to balance the budget during the first term of President Reagan.

Unofficially they had given up months ago as two events make clear. The first is the revelation in the Stockman article. The second is clear fact and arithmetic.

When the Reagan administration came in they were faced with a \$40 to \$45 billion 1982 deficit. They knew this. It was public knowledge.

In the face of this they proposed a \$38 billion cut in the budget, which left them with a small deficit for the year.

But they then added a \$7 billion increase in the military budget and a tax cut of \$40 billion during fiscal year 1982. That meant, by the clear arithmetic itself, a \$49 to \$54 billion deficit. They abandoned the balanced budget. The projections for fiscal years 1983 and 1984, based on the fiscal year 1982 numbers, make a balanced budget impossible using their numbers and their program.

Since then, the reaction of the financial markets to this news and the onset

of the recession has pushed the budget out of shape even more.

SUPPLY SIDERS LIKE KEYNESIANS

But the point is that they have done this with their eyes open. The supply siders have always talked like Keynesian economists: "The deficit does not matter." "The deficit is now only a small part of the GNP." "It is manageable."

Therefore, what is needed is fundamental shift in policy to make a balanced budget a goal of administration economic policy. Short of that they will never achieve a balanced budget and the adverse effects on housing, autos, farmers, and high interest and inflation rates will continue.

The Reagan administration seems to have abandoned the old time religion. The party of William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Dwight Eisenhower, Robert A. Taft, BARRY GOLDWATER, and Gerald Ford has abandoned the balanced budget for the siren song of the supply siders which says deficits do not count and that by pushing on a spring we can guarantee progress and prosperity.

Because of the recession it will be impossible to provide a balanced budget in fiscal year 1982, this year. With unemployment anticipated at 9 percent or more and a falling off of production, investment and sales, Government expenditures will go up while tax receipts decline.

PREPARE NOW FOR BALANCED BUDGET

A deficit in a period of recession is justified. Our problem has been that we have had a series of deficits going back for more than 20 years, not only in periods of high unemployment and recession, but in periods of rapid growth, relatively full employment, and runaway inflation.

Where do we go from here? We should work now to provide a balanced budget in the periods of recovery and prosperity which follow the recession.

Unless we provide either for large cuts in future spending or increase in revenues, or a combination of both in fiscal years 1983 and 1984, both the inflation rate and interest rates will zoom to their recent levels and above in those years.

So the time to prepare for a balanced budget and a surplus in fiscal year 1983 and fiscal year 1984 is now. There are a variety of tools and policies by which such a program can be carried out. Here are some of them.

AGENDA FOR ACTION

Let me list a kind of agenda for action: First, the President is now preparing the fiscal year 1983 budget. It will be proposed next January.

That budget could provide revenues and expenditures which would be in balance if the economy recovers and real economic growth in fiscal year 1983 is 3 percent or more—a balanced budget with growth of 3 percent or more.

Second, the President can propose a budget which limits Federal expenditures to a specific percent of GNP. I propose

that for fiscal year 1983 expenditures be limited to 19 percent or less of GNP. That would force additional discipline on spending and get us closer to a balanced budget.

Third, the President can use the debt ceiling as a tool to enforce fiscal discipline. As I said, he has 10 months and 15 days before the present debt ceiling is reached. He was given an additional \$94 billion of spending since Congress authorized the increase in the temporary ceiling.

About \$75 or \$80 billion of that still remains. He should announce now that there will be no further increase in the debt ceiling and force his administration, the departmental budget officers, the Office of Management and Budget, and both Houses of Congress to find the cuts between now and then so we can live within the existing debt ceiling.

Fourth, he can apply stricter limits of off-budget lending, to the credit budget, and to loans and loan guarantees of the Federal Government which play such an important part in putting the Government into the money markets and competing with the private sector for funds for housing, autos, and consumer goods.

Fifth, he must make the most rigorous examination of the military budget in order to cut out the fat and waste, the frills and excess baggage, and to see to it that the military budget is spent for military purposes. In addition, he and his administration must concentrate on saving massive amounts of money in the area of military contracting by moving from a system which is primarily one of sole-source or negotiated bidding to a system of competitive bidding.

Furthermore, we need to put an end to gold plating and emphasize simpler, less complex and more efficient weapons.

BALANCE BUDGET IN 1983

These are just a few of the things the President can do to make certain that as the economy recovers, which both he and his chief economic advisers confidently predict for the middle of 1982, that we move strongly and purposefully toward a balanced budget in fiscal year 1983.

Mr. President, there is always debate as to whether we should balance the budget under certain economic conditions. The general consensus is we are going to have recovery beginning next summer when the 10-percent income tax reduction takes effect, that this will be an enormous boost to consumer spending and to the optimism of business, and that we will economically expand in advance.

That may well be right. I think the general feeling is we will have a growth of at least 3, 4, 5 percent or more. Under those circumstances we should balance the budget. That means we go into 1983—October 1, 1982, of course, the fiscal year begins—we go into that year with a rising economy, with an expanding economy, with circumstances in which we should, of course, balance the budget.

Instead of abandoning the balanced budget, the President should abandon

the pessimism of the supply-side economists on the right who, like their opposite numbers on the left, tell us deficits do not matter and that we owe the debt to ourselves.

Through both tax and spending policies put in place in the 1983 fiscal year budget we must move massively toward a balanced budget and a surplus as the economy moves out of recession and into expansion at the end of the present period of decline.

The time to plan for that is now.

The place to carry it out is through the fiscal year 1983 budget document.

THE CONTINUING TRAGEDY IN UGANDA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an article in the November 13, 1981 Washington Post details the horrors of Ugandan refugees fleeing their country by the thousands and desperately seeking sanctuary in Zaire and Sudan.

This is the aftermath of Idi Amin's genocidal activities, a continuing tragedy and a nightmare from which the survivors are still seeking relief.

Thousands of soldiers from Amin's defeated Army, as well as defectors who fought as mercenaries with the Tanzanian invasion forces, now roam the dense forests where Uganda, Zaire, and Sudan converge.

Apparently still well-armed, the guerrillas ambush security forces and terrorize the local population as well as the hundreds of thousands of refugees who fled during and after Amin's reign of terror.

The guerrillas have virtually depopulated wide areas of the West Nile Province, home of the Kakwa ethnic group to which Amin belonged. Refugee officials say that Arua, just inside Uganda, has been completely destroyed.

Government officials in Sudan and Zaire are apprehensive about the effects of the refugee influx on their strained economies, and fear disruption of a precarious political and social stability.

An estimated 185,000 refugees have arrived in the region around the Zairian border town of Aru since April, 1979. Since June, 1981 45,000 have arrived in the aftermath of increased attacks in the northwest region of Uganda.

At least 250,000 refugees have fled to southern Sudan, a country already harboring an equal number of Eritrean refugees from Ethiopia. Refugee camps are overcrowded, diseases have broken out, and food and medical supplies are scarce.

Mr. President, the effects of Idi Amin's reign of terror did not end with his Army's defeat or with his escape from Uganda. The people of Uganda who survived his genocidal acts continue to suffer.

Mr. President, our ratification of the Genocide Convention will not restore Amin's victims to life or the survivors to health and freedom from want. But what of the next bloody dictator, Mr. President, and what of his victims? The United States, as a signatory to a Con-

vention created to prevent genocide, might have brought the full weight of the international community to bear against Amin's atrocities.

If ratification of the Genocide Convention saves even one tribe from extinction, how will we answer our national conscience if we continue to delay? Mr. President, I urge immediate ratification of the Genocide Convention.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 20 minutes with statements limited therein to 3 minutes each.

CORPORATE CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS—S. 1834

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, during the past few months we have said a great deal about the Federal Government enabling local communities and voluntary organizations to play a greater role in solving our Nation's problems. We have introduced a bill (S. 1834) that will increase the capacity of the private sector to address the problems we face as a society.

The spending reductions approved by Congress, though necessary, will have a severe effect on charitable organizations. One study estimates that voluntary organizations will lose over \$27 billion in the next 3 years from the cutbacks in traditional Federal support. Inevitably, charities will suffer further funding setbacks as State and local governments look for ways to trim overburdened budgets.

In addition to reductions in funding through Government programs, charities also face reduced incentives for giving created by this year's Economic Recovery Tax Act. It has been estimated that those changes in the tax law will reduce giving over the next 4 years by \$18 billion in current dollars and \$10 billion in constant dollars from what giving would have been if the tax law had not changed.

Yet this country has never needed the services of our voluntary organizations more. We cannot expect charities and voluntary organizations to take on a much greater role in solving the Nation's problems while, at the same time, we do nothing to help these groups compensate for the losses they have suffered. I do not intend to let this happen, which is why I join in support of this bill.

This bill is intended to enhance what has become one of the most important sources of charitable contributions and the source with the greatest growth potential: corporate giving. It does so by permitting shareholders a say in directing corporate giving through their stock dividends.

Specifically, our bill will permit shareholders each year to direct that one or more of their quarterly dividends be given to a charity designated by the shareholder. The shareholder then will

not have this dividend taxed to him or her as income—nor will the shareholder be entitled to receive a charitable deduction for the gift. The corporation, in turn, would give to the designated charity an amount that after taxes would leave the corporation in the same position as if it had paid the dividend to the shareholder.

To use a simplified example, let us assume the corporation's maximum tax rate is 40 percent. If a shareholder were to designate his \$100 quarterly dividend to a favorite charity, the corporation would then give that charity \$167, receiving a \$167 charitable contribution deduction for an effective cost to the corporation of \$100. That is the same cost to the corporation as making the \$100 dividend to the shareholder, since dividends are not deductible by the corporation.

So, Mr. President, this simple modification of current law will result in increased giving to charities when shareholders realize that foregoing a dividend will result in a donation of substantially more than the amount of the dividend. Let me stress again the tremendous pressure we have put on voluntary organizations—the future success of our fight against social problems does not lie solely with the Federal Government.

The private sector must now play an increased role in the effort. As we turn more and more services and responsibility over to volunteers, the very least we can do is also give them the financial and moral support they deserve during this crucial period of transition. America's charities are willing to meet the new demands we have placed on them. Passage of this bill would help to give them the capability to succeed.

ORDER FOR 2-HOUR RECESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, as I indicated earlier, there are caucuses that will occur between the hours of 12 and 2 p.m. today on both sides of the aisles. I ask unanimous consent that at 12 o'clock the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 2 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I inquire of the Chair if there is any further morning business to be transacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further morning business?

If not, morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1982

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume consideration of the

pending business, H.R. 4169, which the clerk will state by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4169) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ARTHUR FLEMMING, PUBLIC SERVANT EXTRAORDINARY

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, it is my intention in just a few minutes to offer an amendment to the bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1982. Before doing that, I should like to comment on what has been reported in the press relative to Arthur Flemming.

Mr. President, Arthur Flemming became chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in March of 1974. Born in Kingston, N.Y., on June 12, 1905, Mr. Flemming was graduated from Ohio Wesleyan University in 1927 and received his master's degree from American University in 1929. He received a juris doctor degree from George Washington University in 1933 and has been granted honorary degrees from a number of colleges and universities.

Mr. President, Arthur Flemming began his academic career as an instructor of government at American University in 1927 and became director of the School of Public Affairs at the university in 1934. He left American University in 1939 to become a member of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, where he served for 9 years. During this time, he also served as chairman of the Labor-Management Manpower Policy Committee of the War Manpower Commission for 3 years.

In 1948, Mr. Flemming was named president of Ohio Wesleyan University. He left this post in 1953 to serve as director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and, after 4 years, resumed the presidency of Ohio Wesleyan.

He was appointed Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1958 by Dwight D. Eisenhower. In 1961, he began a 7-year term as the president of the University of Oregon and then became president of Macalester College, where he remained for 3 years.

Mr. Flemming was nominated chairman of the White House Conference on Aging in 1971 and special presidential consultant on aging in 1972. He served as commissioner on aging of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from 1973 to 1978.

A member of the first and second Hoover Commissions on the organization of the executive branch, Mr. Flemming also served as a member of President Eisenhower's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, a member of the International Civil Service Advisory Board, and chairman of the National Advisory Committee of Upward Bound.

Mr. Flemming was appointed president of the Oregon Council of Churches in 1964, president of the National Council of Churches of Christ in America in 1966, and president of the National Council on Social Welfare in 1968. He also served as chairman of the American Council on Education in 1969.

Mr. President, I have known Arthur Flemming for the past 8 years, during the time that I have served on the subcommittee on appropriations dealing with the Departments of Commerce, Justice, State, and other related agencies. I think every American, I know every American can be proud of the stewardship that Arthur Flemming brought to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. He was a great credit to the Eisenhower administration in his capacity as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He has been a great credit to the academic community, and he has been a great credit to all Americans, especially to the cause of civil rights since his attaining the chairmanship of that Commission. I am deeply disappointed—deeply disappointed—in the news I heard today, which is that he has been asked to step aside.

Mr. President, if there was ever a gentle man and a perceptive man, it is Arthur Flemming. Nobody of any color or race brought more conviction to the job, to the mission, than Arthur Flemming.

I do not know what party he is registered in, Mr. President. I assume, since he was a member of the Eisenhower Cabinet, he is a Republican. Believe me, there are few Republicans that have distinguished themselves in the area of civil rights. Mr. Flemming is one of them. This country is better today for his efforts.

It escapes me as to how this administration, which is not exactly perceived as being activist in the area of civil rights, would want to let go one of the few Republicans in this country who is so perceived.

By means of these few words on the Senate floor, I just want to let Arthur Flemming know that I think he is one of the great Americans of these times, and he has never been needed more than he is needed today. Democrat and Republican, white and black, look upon civil rights as a matter of nostalgia in the past; and many of the gains that were achieved under the aegis of Arthur Flemming and others are being lost. So whatever else will now occupy his energies, I certainly wish him well.

I also wish the President would reconsider what he is doing here and take the advice of those who know about civil rights and have this fine Republican at his side during what I think are going

to be very difficult times ahead in this area.

Mr. President, I am ready to present an amendment. I do not have the amendment with me at this time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 632

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 632:

On page 31, line 24, after the period, insert the following: "except that nothing in this act shall be interpreted as the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, first of all, I commend the clerk for reading my handwriting.

Mr. President, what I have done here is to use the actual words of the Constitution of the United States rather than to use the all-encompassing word "constitutional." We now have an attempt to put into this bill the specific language of the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Since many of my brethren are trying to amend the Constitution legislatively, I think I will try to protect the Constitution legislatively and let us see if we can go ahead and have my colleagues rise to their feet here and vote against the specific wording of the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, the issue has not changed since debate on this floor yesterday. I think there are very few moments that I have been as disappointed in the action of the Senate as I was when in effect we went contrary to the Constitution and to the history of the interpretation of the Constitution.

The matter of religion is not something that belongs in the affairs of this Government. Religion is a personal, not an official thing in the United States of America.

It has de facto achieved official status, but that did not make it right.

I think it is safe to say for over 100 years Protestantism was de facto if not de jure the official religion of this country. Because it was, large numbers of persons were deeply wronged.

Those who come to mind most easily are Catholics, who until the election of

John Kennedy were discriminated against in the American political system; Jews who were discriminated against in the American political system.

The fact is that we do not recognize any particular faith. It is not the job of any Senator to take up on the floor whether a rabbi leads off on Saturday or the priest leads off on Sunday.

And this word that is bandied about the floor that we are living under the Judeo-Christian ethic, I see no words in the Constitution about the Judeo-Christian ethic. The only thing that is in the Constitution of the United States is amendment one:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

That is it. That is all that it says about religion. It is no more than that.

If an understanding of the Constitution of the United States is not clear on the floor of the Senate, where is it understood, where is it any more loved, where is it to be followed?

I want to make it clear to those who are engaged in this broad range of assaults that talk prolife, proprayer, who is against life, who is against prayer? No one that I know of.

In this instance the oath of office which I took to the Constitution of the United States makes it incumbent upon me to fight with every breath in my body to permit anyone to practice anything that he or she cares to in terms of his or her religion, anything; that he or she may practice in total freedom, not just freedom by law but freedom by virtue of fact.

And the minute religion intrudes upon the Government of this country in the sense of it becoming official we set person against person and community against community.

It is the law, it is the Constitution that has given to each one of us that freedom which I am committed to defend here on the floor with many of my other colleagues.

It just did not happen. This Nation was founded because of the violent acts of religion in another country thousands of miles away.

In the name of religion more mayhem and mischief has been committed in the history of this world than for any other cause.

My creed is the Constitution of the United States. It is not the creed of any other faith or any faith.

And so I hope in this very simple amendment that my colleagues will join with me in reaffirming their commitment to those magnificent words:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Now, Mr. President, unless there is further to be said on the subject, I am quite prepared to move to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further debate on the amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

On the question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. SASSER) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) is absent because of illness.

I also announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN) is absent because of death in the family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 380 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Abdnor	Garn	Moynihan
Andrews	Glenn	Murkowski
Armstrong	Gorton	Nickles
Baker	Grassley	Nunn
Baucus	Hart	Packwood
Bentsen	Hatch	Pell
Biden	Hatfield	Percy
Boren	Hawkins	Pressler
Boschwitz	Hayakawa	Proxmire
Bradley	Heinz	Quayle
Bumpers	Helms	Randolph
Burdick	Hollings	Riegle
Byrd	Huddleston	Roth
Harry F., Jr.	Humphrey	Rudman
Byrd, Robert C.	Inouye	Sarbanes
Chafee	Jackson	Schmitt
Chiles	Jepson	Simpson
Cochran	Johnston	Specter
Cohen	Kassebaum	Stafford
Cranston	Kasten	Stennis
D'Amato	Kennedy	Stevens
Danforth	Laxalt	Symms
DeConcini	Levin	Thurmond
Denton	Long	Tower
Dixon	Lugar	Tsongas
Dodd	Mathias	Wallop
Dole	Matsunaga	Warner
Durenberger	Mattingly	Weicker
Eagleton	McClure	Williams
East	Melcher	Zorinsky
Exon	Metzenbaum	
Ford	Mitchell	

NOT VOTING—7

Cannon	Hefflin	Sasser
Domenici	Leahy	
Goldwater	Pryor	

So Mr. WEICKER's amendment (UP No. 632) was agreed to.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on this measure be extended for not to exceed 5 minutes in order for me to make a statement and the distinguished Senator from North Carolina to offer an amendment in respect to this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until the hour of 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE ON TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order on tomorrow, the Senate resume consideration of the pending business, and that at that time the amendment of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, which he is about to offer, will be the pending amendment; that at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow, the Senate temporarily lay aside this measure in order to accommodate the previous order for the vote on nine treaties, and that immediately following that vote, without further debate, intervening motion, or appeal, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Helms amendment.

Mr. HELMS. If the distinguished majority leader will yield, if the amendment is not accepted.

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1982

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina so that he may offer his amendment. I believe there will be approximately 4 minutes of debate left for that measure, at which time, under the order previously entered, the Chair will put the Senate into recess until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

I might say that this arrangement has been cleared with the minority leader, who has just left the floor to attend an official function.

Mr. President, at 2 o'clock this afternoon, I intend to ask the Senate to temporarily lay aside this measure in order to go to the foreign assistance appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for what I trust is a correct perception of the intent of the amendment just adopted, which I urged all Senators to support. There never has been a question that it would be the "establishment of a religion" to have children be permitted to engage in voluntary prayer. Certainly, there is no prohibition of the free exercise of religion involved in school prayer. The question has been contrived as a result of the Supreme Court's meddling in a matter that was none of the Court's business in the first place.

Mr. President, I have been presiding over a farm bill conference on the House side. I could not be here for the discussion of the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. I would mention now that had I been able to be here, I would have suggested that instead of the word "except" at the beginning of Senator WEICKER's amendment the word "and" be used instead. Of course, being tied up elsewhere, I was not able to do that.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 633

(Subsequently numbered amendment No. 633.)

Mr. HELMS. So, Mr. President, simply to make clear that there is no intent to derogate the limitation on expenditures in the Senate's unanimous approval of the Weicker amendment, I send an unprinted amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 633:

On page 31, at the end of line 24, insert the following:

"Provided further, That nothing in this provision shall be interpreted in derogation of the limitation on expenditures stated herein".

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, it may be that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut would be willing to accept this amendment and there would then be no need for any further discussion, now or later.

Mr. WEICKER. I say to my good friend from North Carolina, I have not had a chance to evaluate the language which he has presented to the Senate. I certainly will do that prior to our returning to this bill on tomorrow. I will be glad to give an answer at that time.

Mr. HELMS. I appreciate that.

Mr. President, inasmuch as I will be in the farm bill conference again tomorrow, I ask that it be in order that I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HELMS. I will say that if the distinguished Senator from Connecticut decides to accept the amendment, I will of course ask that the yeas and nays be vitiated on tomorrow.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WEICKER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

RECESS UNTIL 2 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:21 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2 p.m., whereupon the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. LUGAR).

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS, 1982

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may temporarily lay aside the pending business and proceed now to the consideration of S. 1802.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1802) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, it has now been more than 2 years since the Senate has considered a regular foreign assistance appropriations bill. It has been more than 3 years since such legislation has been signed into law. We are into the third year of continuing resolutions, and while the House Appropriations Committee has reported out foreign assistance legislation, it is nonetheless beginning to look like fiscal year 1982 will be the third full year of trying to manage and administer U.S. foreign assistance programs under a continuing resolution—a resolution, incidentally, which has as its base the unenacted conference report for fiscal year 1980.

Mr. President, it is against this background that the committee took the unusual step of reporting an original appropriation bill. We took this action for several reasons, but I believe we must emphasize that we did not take this action as a slap at the House.

On the contrary, the chairman and ranking Republican member of the House subcommittee have repeatedly indicated their own strong desires to get a foreign assistance appropriations bill enacted this year.

Hopefully our action here will help them in their efforts. I especially hope that our action will cause the administration to double its efforts, at the highest levels, and help those in the House who are working for enactment of the foreign assistance appropriations bill.

Mr. President, the bill as reported to the Senate provides for a total appropriation of \$7,250,083,804 in new budget authority, \$338,084,879 below the administration's September request, and \$344,196,260 below the amount recommended in similar legislation reported in the House. The committee's recommendation is \$1,505,981,028 below the President's March budget request. However, the committee's recommendation for the Export-Import Bank's program limitation is substantially above the administration's request.

The committee bill provides for a direct loan limitation of \$4.7 billion, nearly \$900 million more than was requested for the Eximbank in the President's September request. The budgetary effect of this recommendation means that the overall bill is over the President's September budget authority request.

However, I believe we are close enough to our goal, especially considering the give and take that will come in a conference with the House.

TITLE I—MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

For multilateral economic assistance the committee is recommending the appropriation of \$1,296,138,804, \$322,318,875 below the administration's September request. Included under this heading are the multilateral development banks and voluntary contributions to United Nations and Organization of American States programs and agencies.

The committee is recommending small reductions, for budgetary reasons, to all of the multilateral development banks except for the soft loan window of the World Bank and for the Asian Development Bank. For the Asian Development Bank, the committee is recommending an appropriation slightly over the administration's September request.

The committee makes this recommendation in order to acknowledge that institution's superior management, which has consistently been more efficient and cost effective than all of the other multilateral banks.

For the International Development Association, the committee is recommending a reduction to the administration's request of \$288 million. This recommendation follows the recommendation and justification originally made by the committee when it approved the first appropriation for IDA VI in the fiscal year 1981 supplemental. While this particular recommendation has created some controversy, it was held up by an overwhelming vote when an attempt was made in the full committee to increase it.

The committee's recommendation for voluntary contributions to U.N. and OAS voluntary programs is approximately \$12.6 million below the administration's request. The committee is recommending \$134.5 million for the United Nations development program and \$38 million for UNICEF, the two most well known and well thought of U.N. programs in this account.

The request for the International Fund for Agricultural Development has been deferred for consideration until fiscal year 1983. The committee's justification for this action is presented in some detail in the committee report.

In recognition of our increased efforts in South America, the committee recommends \$16.5 million for the OAS programs, the same as the President's March request.

TITLE II—BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

For bilateral economic assistance, the committee is recommending an appropriation level which is \$140,766,000 below the administration's September request. The primary accounts under this heading are the Agency for International Development's functional accounts, which make up \$1.2 billion of the committee's recommendation, and the economic support fund, which makes up \$2,549 billion of the committee's recommendation.

The latter account provides funding to those countries which have a special political and security relationship with the United States, the primary ones being Egypt and Israel.

Other accounts included under this heading are the State Department's migration and refugee assistance program and its international narcotics control program, the Peace Corps, and the Inter-American Foundation.

TITLE III—FOREIGN MILITARY ASSISTANCE

The committee is recommending the full budget request for title III, the foreign military assistance program. This program is made up of three programs.

First is the military assistance grant program, which provides grant military equipment and services to selected allies around the world. This program is phasing out, and unless something unforeseen develops, this is the last year for this particular program.

The second part of the foreign military assistance program is the international military education and training program. This program provides grant assistance for the training of military personnel from other countries. This training is done both in the United States and at institutions overseas, primarily the schools in the Panama Canal Zone.

The third military assistance program, and by far the largest one, is the foreign military credit sales program. Under this program the United States provides credits so that selected friends and allies may purchase military equipment.

In addition, there are direct credits in the form of grants to selected countries, primarily Israel. The committee is recommending a total appropriation of \$1,096,376,000 for this title.

TITLE IV—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The committee's recommendation for the Export-Import Bank is substantially above the administration's request. For the direct loan program the committee is recommending a program limitation of \$4.7 billion, compared to the administration's September request of \$3,872,000,000. For the guarantee and insurance limitations, the committee is recommending \$9,220,000,000, \$1 billion more than the administration's request. This latter amount does not have any budgetary effect. The \$1 billion add-on breaks down into \$500 million for increased guarantee commitments and \$500 million in FCIA insurance.

The committee strongly supports the Export-Import Bank, and, in fact, there

was quite a bit of sentiment to go even higher than we did. However, the budgetary situation is such that the committee felt it could not add any more than it did.

Parenthetically, there is a great deal of concern in the committee with respect to the management of the Bank. The committee has learned only second hand of a number of new policy directions which have been done without consultation. In the future, the committee expects to be so consulted.

Mr. President, the thread which ties the rationale for the U.S. foreign assistance program together can be described in one word—that word is stability. Whether our foreign assistance program is in the form of military assistance to Israel, or whether it is in the form of rural health clinics in Upper Volta, in both cases the purpose is to promote a stable world.

It is perhaps easiest to see this in our foreign military assistance program, where our assistance is seen directly as providing for security and stability from outside interference.

However, there are other destabilizing factors, not military, which our foreign assistance program seeks to address. Surely the orderly economic development of any country in the world is to our advantage, and through the various types of foreign economic assistance, whether it be population control or agricultural related, the rationale is to promote stability.

It does not take the citation of too many examples to show where a world which is not in a stable condition works toward the disadvantage of the United States. The type of world we hope for will open more markets for U.S. goods, meaning more jobs for American workers. A peaceful continent of Africa and South America results in a steady supply of many of the most crucial raw materials the United States needs. A stable Middle East means secure energy supplies, and a safe Israel.

Mr. President, I know it is difficult for many of my colleagues to support the foreign assistance program, and frankly I have been one who in the past has been very critical of foreign aid. There remains much in the program which deserves criticism, but I think overall we must recognize it as a selfish vehicle, one that is meant to serve U.S. interests, though surely it does not do as good a job as we would wish.

So, while I do not expect to make foreign aid supporters out of long-time foreign aid detractors, I do believe that a thoughtful consideration of some of the arguments I have just made would at least cause them to recognize the possibility of value in this program.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a letter to me from David Stockman, in which he indicates that except for some problems with the Export-Import Bank, the administration views this bill as furthering "the President's goal of holding down the budget and reducing the deficit."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. President, before I yield the floor to the ranking minority member, I would like to express my personal appreciation to Senator INOUE, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, who has been the leader and chairman of this subcommittee for many years.

Senator INOUE has been tremendously helpful to me, always cooperative and understanding. It has been a great personal pleasure to work with him. I value his advice and I am enjoying his friendship, which I am confident will grow as years go by.

I would also like to thank the subcommittee staff who have done an outstanding job. I especially thank Jim Bond, his assistant, Ms. Jane McGhee, and also Richard Collins on the minority staff. They have worked hard and cooperatively in producing this bill which is before us today.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

At this time, I yield the floor to Senator INOUE for his opening statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

EXHIBIT 1

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., November 13, 1981.

Hon. ROBERT W. KASTEN, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations,
Committee on Appropriations, U.S.
Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As the Senate prepares to take floor action on S. 1802, the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, 1982, I wish to bring to your attention the Administration's views on the bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The Senate bill is generally in accord with the Administration request. While budget authority exceeds the September request by \$338 million, or 3 percent, the resulting fiscal year 1982 outlay increase would be only \$89 million. As reported by the Appropriations Committee, the Senate bill helps further the President's goal of holding down the budget and reducing the deficit.

The Administration has concerns, however, with the proposed treatment of the Export-Import Bank's credit limitations in this bill.

The \$4.7 billion limitation on the Export-Import Bank's direct loan obligations and \$9.22 billion limitation on loan guarantee commitments proposed in the bill substantially exceed the Administration's requests of \$3.87 billion and \$8.22 billion, respectively. They result in an increase of \$828 million in budget authority, with resulting outlay increases of \$83 million in 1982. Of even greater concern are outlay increases of \$257 million in 1983, and \$174 million in 1984.

There is also a special concern that S. 1802 proposes, for the first time, to set statutory minimums, or "floors" on new lending activities of the Bank. Such floors are highly undesirable, since they could force the Bank to seek additional business that may not be justifiable on economic or policy grounds.

I know that you share the Administration's continued commitment to reduce the growth of Federal spending. I hope that you will consider the Administration's concerns as you proceed with floor action on the bill.

Sincerely,

DAVID A. STOCKMAN,
Director.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I wish to thank my chairman for his kind words.

I join him in expressing gratitude to Mr. Bond, Ms. McGhee, and Richard Collins.

It has been my pleasure to work with the Senator from Wisconsin as he has learned his craft and developed the skills of a U.S. Senator. Senator KASTEN began the year as a freshman Senator. Before the day is out, I predict he will be a seasoned veteran. He has done a remarkable job, and I have, indeed, enjoyed working with him.

The chairman has enumerated the budgetary comparisons between this bill and the President's budget request, as well as the House-reported bill. I will not repeat those comparisons, but I do wish to echo Senator KASTEN's words and offer an explanation of why we are considering this bill—a Senate bill—today.

The foreign assistance programs of our country have been funded under continuing resolutions for the past 2 years. They continue to be funded in this manner at the present time, and there is a strong possibility that they will be funded under a continuing resolution for the remainder of fiscal year 1982.

Mr. President, when the administrators of Government agencies must operate their programs under the authority of a continuing resolution, they lose many of their management tools: necessary management decisions and personnel actions are delayed; planning and budgeting are tied to conditions which may no longer exist. Imagine trying to administer a program in 1982 under funding provisions and restrictions which were established in 1979. It is a difficult, if not impossible, task to do well. And yet, that is what we will require the administrators of these programs to do, if we do not enact a foreign assistance appropriations bill or—and here is the crux of the matter—make a fundamental adjustment in the terms of the continuing resolution. We can do that by making the Senate-reported bill, as amended, the base for calculating a rate of operations under a new continuing resolution.

It is as simple as that. We can force Government managers to make costly adjustments to outdated legislation or we can fulfill our responsibilities and legislate.

Mr. President, I strongly support the actions of the Appropriations Committee to bring this bill to the Senate floor. I do have some continuing concerns, and I shall address them when I offer amendments for consideration by the Senate.

There is one fundamental, overriding concern, however, which I wish to speak about now. I have said that I support the actions of the Appropriations Committee in bringing this bill before the Senate. I have said that, even though I am distressed by the lack of balance in this bill, because I believe it is our duty to draft legislation and to present it to the Senate for consideration and possible amendment.

Nonetheless, I would be remiss if I did not state, in unequivocal terms, my belief that an altogether disproportionate amount of the funding proposals in this bill are predicated on security assumptions primarily military in nature. This bill would provide appropriations to finance nearly \$6 billion—\$5,717,476,000—in security assistance and arms credits. The total of economic development assistance, excluding our refugee assistance

programs, is only about one-half that amount, \$3,118,207,804.

In this regard, let me note briefly what I regard as more than a curious anomaly. Global arms sales, according to the Department of Defense, increased by \$1.3 billion in fiscal year 1971 to \$15.2 billion in fiscal year 1980. The United States has surpassed the Soviet Union as the world's principal arms exporter. In the period 1977-80, the United States exported more than \$24 billion in arms. This was 43 percent of the world total, as compared to 27 percent for the Soviet Union.

And yet, Mr. President, international stability has not increased. Listen to these comparisons:

In 1978, Nicaragua, having a per capita income of \$840, spent \$28 per capita on military expenditures but only \$13 on health.

In the same year, Vietnam spent \$18 per capita on military expenditures but only \$4 on education and \$1 on health.

In the Middle East, Egypt spent \$91 per capita on the military but only \$28 on education and \$9 on health.

Apparently, arms sales do not contribute to stability. Rather than increasing stability and creating a favorable environment for U.S. economic goals, they have caused a fundamental shift in world opinion. Recent studies indicate that an increasing number of people in the non-Socialist world have come to regard the United States, not as the protector of the peace but as the proponent of arms sales.

Mr. President, our international security assistance programs are an important part of our overall foreign assistance programs. But when we allow them to dominate our relations with the developing world, we make the mistake of attempting to impose rather than create stability. The preponderant weight given to international security assistance and arms credits in this bill reveals, I believe, a fundamental misperception of the basic causes of instability in today's complex world.

In my view, the greatest threat to international stability is internal violence in the form of subversive or revolutionary movements bred by the conditions of crushing poverty and malnutrition in the developing world. It must be asked, if we make it easier for developing countries to opt for arms instead of bread for their people, do we improve their security? I think not. To the contrary, I believe that, if we base our foreign assistance policies on considerations which place too heavy an emphasis on military threats to security, our programs will fail to come to terms with the basic causes of instability and will deny the fundamental requirements of human existence to those in need. Military assistance, by any name, cannot serve to promote stability where it is threatened by economic discontent. If men are to work for peaceful social change, they must be encouraged to believe that their rightful demands will be met with enlightened humanitarian assistance and not repression by force of arms.

The funding level recommended by the committee would provide exactly what the President requested for mili-

tary assistance, for security assistance, for military training assistance, and for arms credits. Only the economic development assistance accounts were reduced.

Mr. President, at an appropriate time I will offer an amendment to provide full funding of the President's request for the International Development Association. I would hope that my colleagues will recognize the necessity of restoring at least a semblance of a balance to this bill.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. QUAYLE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 634

(Purpose: Increase funding for the Sudan by \$50 million, earmark funding for Egypt, Israel and Cyprus, and eliminate Committee language prohibiting assistance to Poland, Tunisia, and Costa Rica)

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTEN) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 634.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On Page 8, Line 19, beginning with "\$2,548,500,000" strike out all through "United States:" on Page 9, Line 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$2,598,500,000: Provided, That of the funds appropriated under this paragraph not less than \$806,000,000 shall be available for Israel, not less than \$771,000,000 shall be available for Egypt, and not less than \$100,000,000 shall be available for Sudan: Provided further, That, except as otherwise provided under this paragraph for Egypt, Israel, Sudan, Cyprus and scholarships for South African students, funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be made available only in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate set forth in a table under the heading "Economic Support Fund" contained in Senate Report No. 97-266:"

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, this amendment serves two purposes. The first purpose is to eliminate the language in the committee bill which has caused some concern among our colleagues. That language prohibited funding for Poland, Tunisia, and Costa Rica, except that it provided that the President could have waived that limitation. The sole purpose for that committee language was technical in nature. The language was designed to effect the committee's decision to support the administration's budget request for the economic support fund, and was required in order to overcome earmarkings in the authorization legislation which would have had the effect of decreasing our recommendations by \$25 million. Since the reporting of this legislation, however, a number of my colleagues have expressed the concern that the language might be misinterpreted. Therefore, this amendment would eliminate that language, but by using other language nonetheless effect the committee's recommendations. As for assistance to Poland, Tunisia, and Costa Rica, such assistance could be provided if the administration so desires.

Mr. President, the main purpose for the amendment now before us is to provide additional funding for the Sudan. This is on the basis of an urgent request by the administration, for which a budget amendment has been prepared and approved.

Mr. President, I have a letter from the President of the United States, dated November 16, 1981, to the Speaker of the House, and also a letter from OMB to the President, dated November 16, 1981, containing that request. I ask unanimous consent that both letters be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

1982 budget appendix page	Heading	1982 budget request	1982 amendments pending	1982 proposed amendment	1982 revised request
I-D7	Economic support fund.....	\$2,431,500,000	\$117,000,000	\$50,000,000	\$2,598,500,000

This proposal provides for additional assistance for Sudan. It would increase 1982 outlays by \$50 million.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, Sudan's economic situation at this time is probably the gravest in Africa. Sudan's external debt has grown to \$5 billion, and it is in arrears on \$2 billion of that debt, its debt service ratio having risen to an alarming 60 to 70 percent of its foreign exchange earnings. Its principal export, cotton, has declined precipitously in the past 10 years due to overvalued exchange rates and movement of farmers into other crops and the shortage of labor. Soaring oil prices have also eaten into the balance of foreign exchange earnings.

Sudan has been one of the few countries in that part of the world to support the Camp David peace process. As a result, Libya, its neighbor to the west, has been actively working to overthrow the current government, trying to capitalize on the current economic situation. As a result, Sudan has appealed to friends such as the United States to provide additional assistance to that being provided by the International Monetary Fund so that it can weather these current difficulties, especially while taking on the hard reforms that are required by the IMF. Sudan has bitten the bullet, but it does need help outside of the IMF action. The IMF estimates that even with the reforms, and with projected debt rescheduling, and with the IMF drawing, Sudan will still be short between \$250

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., November 16, 1981.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Sir: I ask the Congress to consider an amendment to the request for appropriations for fiscal year 1982 in the amount of \$50,000,000 for foreign assistance.

The details of this proposal are set forth in the enclosed letter from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. I concur with his comments and observations.

Respectfully,

RONALD REAGAN.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, D.C., November 16, 1981.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

Sir: I have the honor to submit for your consideration an amendment to the request for appropriations in fiscal year 1982 in the amount of \$50,000,000 for foreign assistance. The details of this request are contained in the enclosure to this letter.

I have carefully reviewed the proposal contained in this document and am satisfied that this request is necessary at this time. I recommend, therefore, that this proposal be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully,

DAVID A. STOCKMAN,

Director.

and \$300 million to meet its obligations in the coming months. Some of these obligations must be met in the next 30 days, thus the urgency of this request.

Mr. President, the Sudan is our friend, a close friend of Egypt's and most importantly, a good friend of the Camp David peace process. I believe it is crucial at this time for the United States to take this action, which will be extremely valuable, both in political and economic terms, to the current Sudanese Government. The timing of this is very important, as President Nimeiri is currently in the United States and it would obviously be helpful to him to take home news of additional U.S. support personally.

Mr. President, one last point: There has been criticism in the past that our military assistance to Sudan has not been responsive to its economic problems. Sudan does, of course, have a legitimate military need, but this funding is economic in nature, and desperately needed at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I am pleased to concur with my chairman, Senator KASTEN. I think his arguments are worthy of our consideration. I wholeheartedly support him in this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (UP No. 634) was agreed to.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 635

(Purpose: To increase fiscal year 1982 appropriations for the International Development Association to the amount requested by the President)

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 635:

On page 3, line 23, strike \$532,000,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$820,000,000.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, technically, the amendment I propose is quite simple. It provides the amount requested by President Reagan for a fiscal year 1982 contribution to the International Development Association. The amount is \$820 million, or \$288 million above the amount recommended by the committee.

Politically, and in relation to our fundamental interests, however, this amendment is not at all simple—it has a direct bearing on international cooperation and global stability and on the position of the United States as the leading economic and political power in the world.

The International Development Association is the so-called "soft-loan window, or concessional lending facility of the World Bank." It extends long-term, interest-free credits to the poorest countries in the world. These are soft loans, but they are not "soft-headed" loans;

Reflecting the importance of the agricultural sector, on which the majority of the world's poor depend, IDA has devoted nearly half of its lending to agricultural and rural development;

The development projects financed by IDA must meet the same economic and financial standards of the World Bank; and

As the ongoing Treasury Department study—which was initiated by the Reagan administration—has indicated, IDA projects have historically enjoyed rates of return equal to or better than U.S. private sector projects.

Mr. President, my amendment would provide \$820 million as the fiscal year 1982 U.S. contribution to the sixth replenishment of IDA resources. As negotiated in international meetings, the U.S. share of IDA VI is \$3.24 billion or 27 percent of total donor contributions. U.S. negotiators—in these international meetings—responded to congressional concerns by achieving a reduction in the U.S. share. In IDA V it was 31 percent; in IDA VI it will be 27 percent.

Of equal importance, our negotiators achieved an increase in the contributions made by others—Japan and Germany, as well as nine other countries have increased their shares. For each dollar the United States contributes, other countries will contribute \$2.70. If the United States contributes \$820 million this year, others

will contribute \$2,220 million. Conversely, if we reduce our contribution, others will reduce theirs. The \$288 million difference between the amount I propose and the amount proposed by the committee will generate \$815 million in contributions from other countries.

We often speak of burden-sharing among the developed countries. Here it is. We contribute \$820 million, and they contribute \$2,220,000,000. Does anyone in this Chamber believe that the United States does not benefit from this burden-sharing? Does anyone in this Chamber believe that the United States would provide \$3,240,000,000 in fiscal year 1982 bilateral assistance for programs which demonstrably serve our national interests?

That, I suggest, is what we would have to do were it not for the burden-sharing arrangements provided in the International Development Association. I would remind skeptics that 7 of the top 10 IDA recipients border on the Indian Ocean. All are of strategic interest to the United States, and all have been courted by the Soviet Union. Our interest in opposing the expansion of Soviet influence dictates our support of IDA.

Mr. President, IDA lending promotes economic development of the less developed countries (LDC's) and thus enhances U.S. exports; 25 percent of all U.S. manufactured exports go to non-oil-producing LDC's. Add the 13 members of the OPEC oil cartel, and the share rises to 38 percent. The developing countries are the largest potential market for U.S. finished products. I trust I need not remind anyone that we are in a recession and that export expansion is important to economic recovery.

Mr. President, there is another aspect of this interdependency which must be recognized. IDA lending promotes economic and political stability in the Third World. The United States has a vital interest in the stability of the Third World. Last year, the United States imported \$49 billion of commodities from non-oil-producing developing countries.

We imported 100 percent of the columbium and strontium we need for steel and other metals and alloys used in our aerospace, machinery, and transportation industries; 93 percent of the bauxite used in the aluminum industry; 62 percent of the zinc used in the electrical, alloy, and construction industries; 90 percent of the cobalt used in industrial and aircraft engines and in the computer industry; 81 percent of the tin used for electrical construction and transport industries.

Mr. President, I hope that the brief arguments I have presented will encourage others to support my amendment. I hope I have demonstrated my belief that U.S. contributions to the International Development Association are, in fact, investments in international stability and that they promote the economic welfare of not only the developing countries but also the United States.

I know that some will remain unconvinced, but I hope they will give their full attention to what I have said. We can no longer indulge in the harsh, often irresponsible and critical rhetoric of the

past. The position of the United States as a world leader is in question. To lead we must participate and to participate we must accept responsibility.

Before he left for the Cancun summit, President Reagan said:

Certainly the record of the international system is not perfect, but people flirt with fantasy when they suggest that it's a failure and unfair.

Let us not flirt with fantasy.

Let us provide full funding of the President's request for IDA.

Mr. President, I point out, as I have on many other occasions, that about 15 years ago, the United Nations conducted an important census which received very little coverage in the press, a census of the world to determine the extent of poverty. It was decided at that time that the dividing line between the rich and the poor should be \$400 per annum—\$400 per year. If your per capita income was \$400 or more, you were considered wealthy in the eyes of the United Nations. If it were \$400 or less, you were considered poor.

At the time the census was taken, the world was divided into 65 percent poor, 35 percent wealthy. Put another way, there were 65 percent have-nots and 35 percent haves. That was 15 years ago.

Today, it is estimated that that ratio has changed from 80 percent poor to 20 percent wealthy. It is also estimated, by projections, that by the year 2000, this world will be divided into two segments—5 percent wealthy and 95 percent poor.

Mr. President, I am a politician. I am not a social scientist or an anthropologist. These numbers frighten me, because these numbers conjure up in my mind revolutions, rebellions, civil wars, civil disorders, civil disasters.

This democracy of ours can only survive in a stable world. The only way our economy can survive is to sell. If we cannot get things such as strontium, bauxite, zinc, cobalt, and tin, we cannot produce.

IDA is one way to help these countries to help themselves. This is one way to bring about stability. This amendment will bring about a proper balance to this bill.

At the present time, two-thirds of the funds appropriated here are for military assistance, one-third for economic and humanitarian assistance. This amendment will bring about a semblance of a balance, and I hope my colleagues will support it.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I reluctantly oppose the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii, because I agree with the sense of his eloquent statement, and I also agree completely with the needs we have for worldwide economic development.

This issue was raised for discussion purposes in the subcommittee. In full committee, we had a vote, and the Senator's amendment was overwhelmingly rejected. That vote was 15 to 5.

The committee's recommendation tracks with the position taken by the full Appropriations Committee. It also tracks with the position that was agreed with by the Senate several months ago, when

we approved the first payment for IDA VI in the fiscal year 1981 supplemental.

The Senate position is the following: We would provide no more over 3 years in the IDA VI appropriation than in the IDA V appropriation—that total was \$2.4 billion—and we would provide the payments in this 3-year period on the same percentage basis as the administration is requesting.

Thus, in fiscal year 1981, it would be \$408 million; in fiscal year 1982, it would be \$624 million; in 1983, it would be \$1,368 billion. However, because the conference agreement on the fiscal year 1981 supplemental provided \$500 million rather than \$408 million, only \$532 million is necessary now to continue the policy adopted on this matter in our 1981 supplemental.

I point out, further, that this amendment represents the administration's request, which represents a 25-percent increase over 3 years of the dollars we provided for the soft loan window of the World Bank under IDA V, the previous agreement. This is at a time when we are being asked to cut back on our other programs.

It makes sense to me that we continue to maintain this level at the previous year's level because it is such an important program, but it does not make sense to increase it by 25 percent at a time when all our domestic programs are under such tremendous pressure. Acceptance of this amendment will drive this bill over the President's budget in both budget authority and outlays.

I also point out to the Senator from Hawaii that with the number I am recommending and that the committee has approved, there is clearly room to maneuver in conference with the House of Representatives. Frankly, we need that maneuvering room in order to get our numbers for the President's budget highest priorities under some of the other categories.

It is my understanding that we will have to do some negotiating in this area. It is also my understanding that the position of many Senators is that we should do a little negotiating in this area and somehow put more of the economic assistance into the overall foreign operations bill and balance that off with some of the military.

I hope that at this time we can maintain the Senate's position, which is to maintain the level of appropriations at the level under item 5 and that we reject the idea of going on with the level that would represent a 25-percent increase in this program at a time when domestic priorities and domestic programs are being cut back.

In truth, Mr. President, I think that by maintaining the current level, we are expressing our support of the kind of economic assistance programs we need. We did not cut this program; it was maintained at the current level. I think it would be a mistake to go further and to increase it by 25 percent.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, it grieves me to stand in opposition to my distinguished chairman. I found it a delight to be working with him during this year.

But on this matter I find that I must uphold the request submitted by the President.

Several weeks ago when the fiscal year 1981 supplemental appropriations bill was taken up, I believe my chairman, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTEN) said in response to the Senator from Missouri (Mr. DANFORTH):

It is not our purpose or interest to force a renegotiation of the sixth replenishment of the International Development Association.

If my chairman will yield, is that the position that he is still maintaining?

Mr. KASTEN. The distinguished Senator from Hawaii is correct. It is not my position, and I do not believe it is the Senate's position to force a renegotiation of IDA, under the terms and arrangements under the IDA VI agreements. I think it is still an open question as to what the amount is going to be when it comes out of conference. I think it is also an open question as to what the amount might be in future years as we were to live up to or attempt to live up to some of the overall commitments we have made.

The Senator is aware there have been discussions about stretching out the payments for an additional year with a number of the contributors. But it is not in any way my intention or the intention of the committee to force a renegotiation of IDA VI.

Mr. INOUE. I believe that the chairman intends to stretch this out for a 3-year period; is that correct?

Mr. KASTEN. Right now the provision is over 3 years. There has been discussion of stretching it out on to a fourth year, and that is the open question.

Mr. INOUE. But the Senator does support the full funding of the amount negotiated by our representatives.

Mr. KASTEN. I do not want to force renegotiation of the agreement, but at this point I think it is unrealistic to support funding of the amount requested for this fiscal year in this particular bill.

Mr. INOUE. My concern is that for fiscal year 1981 supplemental we appropriated \$500 million and the committee chairman's recommendation is \$532 million for fiscal year 1982. That would leave a balance of \$2.028 billion that we agreed to in the negotiations for IDA IV. I do not see how we can appropriate \$1.104 billion in each of the next 2 fiscal years with the cap in mind. I think it would be an impossible chore.

Mr. KASTEN. With the present budgetary constraints we are faced with I think it will be an exceedingly difficult chore and it is in looking at those numbers that a number of people have at least brought up the possibility of stretching the commitments over into a fourth year or into part of a fourth year. That is an open question right now, and it depends a great deal upon the final amount that we come out of conference in and also the attitude of the administration with these amounts. But I think to change the Senate position at this time as the Senator's amendment would do great harm to this bill. It would put it over the President's request and it would also back us away from the

position that we have taken in the subcommittee, the full committee, and the Senate, that this program should not be cut back but it certainly should not be increased 25 percent at a time when domestic programs are under so much pressure.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this juncture two letters, one dated November 6, 1981, the other dated November 12, 1981, from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Donald T. Regan.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., November 6, 1981.
Hon. DANIEL K. INOUE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR INOUE: I want you to know that your effort to restore the Administration's requested level of funding for the IDA VI replenishment during the Appropriations Committee mark-up of the foreign assistance appropriations bill is deeply appreciated.

We believe it is important to maintain our leadership in these international institutions, and thus have pledged to support previously negotiated agreements, albeit on an adjusted contribution schedule in recognition of domestic economic requirements.

While the Committee has provided a lower funding level for IDA than requested, I am hopeful that in conference with the House that level will be brought closer to the Administration's request. Again, your continuing support for this program and for the Administration's request is greatly appreciated.

With best wishes.
Sincerely,

DONALD T. REGAN.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., November 12, 1981.
Hon. DANIEL K. INOUE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR INOUE: I understand you will propose an amendment to the fiscal year 1982 foreign assistance appropriations bill to increase funding for the International Development Association (IDA) to the level requested by the President. I appreciate your support for the Administration's position in this matter and hope your colleagues will support your amendment.

IDA provides economic assistance to the world's poorest countries. Seven of the top ten borrowers are on the periphery of the Indian Ocean—Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Kenya, Egypt, Tanzania, Sudan, and India. All have been the targets of Soviet efforts to expand influence.

A major conclusion of the Administration's review of policies toward the multilateral development banks is that these institutions can be important instruments for promoting rational economic policies, which free the private sector to play a stronger role in developing countries. If we are to persuade other members to follow our leadership and to join us in supporting such policies, we will need clear signals of Congressional support for the Administration's position.

Due to budgetary constraints, the Administration's requests for IDA in 1981 and 1982 are sharp reductions compared to amounts provided in 1979 and 1980. Further reductions would have a minimal effect on outlays, since the full \$820 million for IDA will result in outlays of about \$25 million and \$75 million in fiscal years 1982 and 1983, respectively.

IDA is a highly visible measure of the seriousness of U.S. intentions toward the banks. Congressional support for the IDA appropriations request is an important indi-

cator of U.S. willingness to assert a leadership role in the multilateral institutions.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DONALD T. REGAN.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for the judgment of the chairman of the subcommittee, the manager of the bill, and I appreciate the arguments that he has made here this afternoon in support of his position, arguments that I think reflect the austerity of the times and the difficult economic situation with which these United States find themselves.

But I feel that in the final analysis I have to come down on the side of the Senator from Hawaii, who has presented I think the stark reality of this situation.

We are not only in tough times in the United States, but we are in tough times in the world, and there has never been a time when it has been more important for us to be able to communicate in an effective and pragmatic way with the rest of the world, and that really is what is at issue here.

It is arming the President, arming the Government of the United States in order to be effective in the world.

What the Senator from Hawaii is doing is merely pressing the budget requests that have been made by the President. I do not think anyone who is familiar with the general policy and position of the Reagan administration would accuse this administration of being spendthrifts. I do not think that anyone would accuse this administration of wasting money deliberately.

And the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii really reflects the careful judgment of the President and Secretary of State and the other responsible officials of the administration.

I believe that this is a budget request that should be taken just as seriously as the request for any weapons system that we propose to add to our arsenal. We should take it just as seriously as any budget request for a defense item because the security of the United States depends upon a great number of things, and among those factors that affect our security and our vital interests are economic factors that can be heavily influenced by the kind of investment which is represented by the President's budget request.

I think we should keep firmly in mind that that is what we are talking about. We are not talking about some wild expenditure that is being proposed as an individual wish by a Member of the Senate. We are talking about the official request of the President as expressed in his budget.

That budget carefully considered, reduced to a bare minimum, reflects the judgment of the highest officials of Government as to what is necessary for our

security and for the protection of our vital interests.

This is not an eleemosynary act. This is not some charity that we are proposing. This is an expenditure to promote the vital interests of this country and I think that is the way the Senator from Hawaii has expressed it.

Therefore, I think that it not only makes eminently good sense to support the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii, but that it also is a necessary thing to do, necessary in the judgment of the President, necessary in the judgment of the Secretary of State, and I think necessary in the judgment of any American who takes a realistic view of the world as it is today and as it is likely to be tomorrow.

So, Mr. President, I intend to vote in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I want to commend my distinguished colleague from Hawaii who certainly, although he did not sit in on the months of deliberations and many, many sessions we had with David Stockman and others in the administration on IDA, has alertly gathered the spirit of the matter.

If we do not fulfill the President's request in this regard, we are going to unnecessarily bring up all kinds of questions as to what our intentions really are. After all, this agreement was worked out after many, many, many months of negotiating with 32 countries, and we have now taken a 3-year program and stretched it out to over 4, backloaded heavily in the final years.

I think the intention and good faith of the United States would be subject to considerable question around the world if the Senate now simply preempted the President on this and destroyed the careful continuity that has been worked out and the negotiating process that has brought us to the stage that we agreed to with the Senate authorizing committee and the President.

There are a number of reasons to support an amendment to bring our contribution to IDA up to the President's request level. These include the importance of IDA's role in furthering development, our strategic interest in many of the countries which receive loans from IDA, and maintenance of U.S. negotiating credibility with our allies.

IDA lends to the poorest countries on Earth. I am in complete accord with the President's view that developing countries must increasingly rely on investment and lending from the private sector. However, many of the countries which receive loans from IDA have not yet reached the stage where they are attractive risks for that sector. They need more educated labor forces, and a minimal infrastructure of basic roads, power,

water, and food production before they will be able to attract much private capital. IDA loans help these countries meet some of these requirements.

I speak, having had some 25 years of experience in investing in countries abroad. I can assure those who are urging us to invest in those countries, I can say that until such time as there is that basic infrastructure, which no private sector can privately finance, they are not going to be prepared. So what we need to do is to put the seed money in that will attract that private capital, that will attract the technology and know-how that will flow once the basic needs have been met, and that is the whole purpose of IDA. That was the original concept from the beginning. It has worked wondrously well. It has taken certain economies that were at one time desperate up to the stage where they are now attractive for private loans, attractive for private investment, attracting not only capital but technology and know-how to their countries; and IDA can literally phase itself out of those countries and the private sector can take over. But we have a lot of countries today that are a long ways from that, and they need our help.

Many of the countries which receive assistance from IDA are of strategic importance to the United States, including Pakistan, Kenya, and the Sudan. We are increasing our bilateral assistance to some of these countries to help them defend themselves against external aggression and improve the lives of their citizens. It hardly makes sense to imperil a multilateral program which provides these same countries with financing from many countries.

Let us just take Pakistan alone. Both administrations, the Carter administration and the Reagan administration, both independently studying this situation of a nation that is strategic to us; a nation beset on one side with an invasion of Afghanistan; endangered because of the Iran-Iraq war, and put in a particularly strategic position because of total change in the evolutionary, revolutionary, process that is going on in Iran. We now are reaching out on a bilateral basis. Two U.S. administrations in a row, have believed it worthwhile to provide military and economic assistance to Pakistan, to bolster it up and give it a sense of security that it desperately needs right at this time.

How much better for us to be able to go to them and, with part of this loan and aid assistance that they need, do it through the World Bank? We know what happens when we bilaterally provide money to countries. Look at the billions of dollars that were forgiven in India alone.

There have not been defaults on the World Bank. There will not be defaults because they value highly the credit rating they have with an international organization of that stature. But many, many times there is resentment built up when we are doing these things and making loans that more properly could be done through the multilateral banks.

Further delay in meeting expected U.S. contributions to the IDA replenishment

will seriously call into question the good faith and dependability of the United States. The United States took an extra year to finally authorize our participation in the replenishment. During that time, in order to allow IDA to keep making commitments, other industrial countries advanced \$1.5 billion in their own funds, even though they had the clear legal right to withhold their contributions until the United States was ready to meet its obligations. They have decided not to do this any longer. This means that every dollar we withhold from IDA results in an additional \$2.7 billion being withheld by other countries. Thus, cutting the President's request by \$300 million results in a total restriction on IDA lending of \$1.1 billion.

This kind of disregard for our commitments to other industrial countries and to the financial impact on the poorest countries in the world will clearly have an impact on our credibility in other areas. We seek the cooperation of both industrial countries and developing countries in many areas which are important to us, ranging from defense relationships to international efforts to deal with communications and environment. If we seem to be capricious and undependable in one area, we are likely to undercut our negotiating ability in others.

I can simply say that if the Senate does this today, if we undercut the President's program, there was no use going to Cancun. All of the work that he did down there, a one-on-one basis with some 20 country leaders, would be for naught if we reverse it, if we show that he is so impotent that he cannot make a commitment of this kind, negotiated over many months by a previous administration and endorsed by this administration. We simply cannot undercut the President of the United States in this area.

And, as the arithmetic shows, it would really work adversely to the interest of the United States of America if we did so.

So I commend my distinguished colleague for his amendment. I urge that the amendment be accepted by the floor manager of the bill, Senator KASTEN, with whom we have all enjoyed working in these areas. We admire the tough-fisted and hardheaded approach in these areas. Someone has to be in that position. In this case, however, I do think when other hardheads, along with his—Secretary of Treasury Regan, Secretary Haig, Judge Clark, and David Stockman, himself—when they all have concurred that the basic program that they have laid out and that we have somewhat modified is the bottom line in this area, I think we ought to back them up and support them.

Mr. KASTEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COCHRAN). The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator from Illinois for his kind comments and to say that it has been my pleasure in working with him. I unfortunately find myself in opposition with him on this particular issue, although I do not disagree with anything the Senator has said in his strong

statement on behalf of increased IDA funding.

The fact is, Mr. President, that we are in a difficult financial position. And I think that the proponents of IDA, frankly, should be satisfied that we are at the level that we have had last year, and that, of course, is the Senate position.

The fact of the matter is that we have found ourselves cutting all sorts of programs—domestic programs, programs which are hitting American citizens. And there is not support, at least not in this Senator's State—and I am not so sure there is much support at plant gates or among people anywhere in this country—to increase funds in this particular area at a time when we are cutting back spending in so many others.

I would also like to remind the various proponents that this is the Senate position; it is the Appropriations Committee position. But we are going to conference. And I think that with our position at this particular level, our position being that we ought not to increase the funding for the soft-loan window of the World Bank, but we should not decry it either. Their position has been for huge increases. And somewhere in between, I think, we might find a ground that would be a whole lot more acceptable to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and also to the ranking minority member of this committee.

But I cannot, Mr. President, agree to this amendment and I must reluctantly, despite my strong respect for the leadership on both sides of the aisle of the Foreign Relations Committee, I must reluctantly oppose this amendment at this time.

● Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, I wish to express my support for the amendment offered by the Senator from Hawaii. The amendment would reinstate the full \$820 million requested by the administration for the U.S. contribution to the International Development Agency (IDA VI) in fiscal year 1982. The amount of money appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations for this purpose, \$828 million less than the previously reduced administration request, falls far short of American obligations and threatens once again to damage our credibility as a reliable participant in international development assistance efforts.

I oppose this reduction in our fiscal year 1982 contribution for the same reasons I opposed a similar reduction proposed by the Appropriations Committee in May during consideration of the Supplemental Appropriations and Rescission Act of 1981 (H.R. 3512). These reasons include:

First, the United States made a commitment in 1979 to contribute a specific amount to IDA. Our credibility is at stake. The administration has already made a major change in that commitment by stretching out our payments. Another reduction in this installment would once again bring into question our ability to live up to this international obligation.

Second, we must not lose sight of the facts and purpose behind the number being debated. We are talking about the

U.S. contribution to an organization that we helped create over 20 years ago, an organization that loans money to the poorest of the world's poor so that they might develop, so that they might grow enough to feed themselves.

Finally, the amendment is fully supported by the administration. These are not numbers that someone pulled out of a hat. They are the product of much thought and extended consultation with our allies.

Take a closer look at IDA.

A multilateral development bank, IDA offers low-interest loans to the world's poorest countries. Almost 75 percent of the lending now goes to the countries with a per capita income of less than \$360.

IDA loans are targeted to the lowest income groups within the recipient countries, aimed at increasing prospects for long-term self-sufficiency. The loans are repaid in full by borrowers and the money is recycled.

Almost one-half of the loans are used to advance agriculture and rural development, and to increase badly needed food production.

More than 30 percent of IDA lending goes to African nations, with such important countries as Egypt, Kenya, Pakistan, and the Sudan highly dependent on the program.

It is important to note that IDA VI, the sixth replenishment of the International Development Association, represents an international agreement, a commitment by our Government to 32 other donor countries. In December 1979, all of the donor countries agreed on a \$12 billion replenishment for 3 years beginning July 1, 1980.

The U.S. share of the arrangement is \$3.24 billion, or 27 percent of the total. This is a decline from our 42-percent share at the inception of IDA.

IDA VI lending was already delayed by 1 year pending approval of the U.S. commitment. By the time the United States got around to offering our first installment, other participant countries had already finalized their offers and had even advanced IDA \$1.9 billion. But the IDA cannot continue lending under an annual threat of the United States reneging on its agreed share.

The U.S. contribution of \$500 million for the first installment was already less than half the amount proposed by the last administration. Instead of paying off our share in three equal installments of \$1.080 million as originally anticipated, we will now be stretching our payments to 4 years. This change has already led some to question our commitment. The further reduction proposed by the Appropriations Committee further jeopardizes our participation in the replenishment effort.

The United States has always prided itself for being a tried and true leader in the international economic scene. I simply cannot understand why the committee is willing to jeopardize that position once again.

The President reaffirmed the administration's support of multilateral institutions in Cancun last month. We should and must stand by these obligations. ●

Mr. INOUE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Will the Chairman yield for a question?

Mr. KASTEN. I would be pleased to yield for a question from the Senator.

Mr. INOUE. Am I correct to assume from the Senator's statement that he will lead the Senate delegation to conference with an open mind in this matter?

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I want to assure the Senator from Hawaii, the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Maryland and others that I understand the importance and the strong support in the Senate for the President's mark. There are a number of items that we are going to work with in conference that would deal with economic and security assistance. It is my intention, No. 1, not to force any kind of renegotiation in the IDA VI round and, No. 2, to try to work with and accommodate the House insofar as we are able to do so within the overall budget constraints and restraints we find ourselves in.

So I go to the conference supporting the Senate position, but knowledgeable that the Senate position is one in which a large number of us would feel that the higher level is more desirable. And I will take that into consideration in our conference deliberations.

Mr. INOUE. Am I also to assume from the Senator's statement that he has no intention to open IDA VI to renegotiation; that he will do his best to stand by the judgment of the negotiators?

Mr. KASTEN. I, in no way, want to force our negotiators to renegotiate IDA VI. I am confident that if there is a stretchout or if there is some other funding level agreed to that any of this can be done working with and accommodating the other contributors to the World Bank. And I am hopeful that we will not have to have any kind of a renegotiation.

It is my very strong feeling that we do not force a renegotiation on IDA VI. But I have an equally strong feeling that we want to work within the overall budget restraints. I do not want to force renegotiation. I would hope a position that would come out of conference would not force a renegotiation.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, with this assurance, and because of my desire to present a united front when we enter into conference with the House, I will withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 636

(Purpose: To provide full funding of the President's fiscal year 1982 request for Population Planning Development Assistance)

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 636.

On page 6, line 3, strike \$190,000,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$211,306,000.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, my amendment would provide full funding of the President's revised request for population planning development assistance—\$211,306,000. This amount is \$21,306,000 more than the committee's recommendation. However, it is still 17 percent below the President's March request of \$253.4 million.

Mr. President, at present, the annual population growth rate in the more developed countries—that is, the United States and Europe—is six-tenths of 1 percent; in the less developed countries, it is 2.1 percent. At these rates, developed country populations will double in 113 years. A more disquieting projection is found in the estimate that the populations of the less developed countries will double in less than 35 years. In fact, United Nations projections indicate that the proportion of people living in developing countries will continue to rise in the remainder of this century—from 66 percent in 1960 to more than 78 percent in the year 2000. In other words, when this century becomes the next, three-fourths of the human population will be the "have-nots" of the world.

Population pressures have become critical and now threaten the future economic and political viability of a large number of developing countries vital to U.S. economic and security interests.

Allow me to give a specific example. The United States regards Egypt as vital to our interests. This is indicated, in part, by the fact that this bill contains funding proposals which would provide Egypt \$1,671,000,000 in bilateral U.S. economic and security assistance in fiscal year 1982.

The present population of Egypt is 43.5 million people, and it is increasing at the rate of 3 percent each year. Forty-four percent of all Egyptians live in urban areas. It is estimated that urban populations in Egypt will double in 20 years. Cairo alone will grow from approximately 8 million people in 1980 to 16.4 million in the year 2000. The United Nations World Housing Survey reported that, in 1976, 60 percent of the people of Cairo lived in slums or squatter settlements. Imagine what it could be in the year 2000.

It does not greatly tax the imagination to think of what Egypt will be like in the year 2000—if population growth is not restrained. The number who live in slums and squatter settlements will increase. The number who have no jobs, no food, no hope will increase. The bitter fruit of despair will be ready for picking, and you may be certain that there will be extremists around to pick it.

We must ask ourselves whether we serve our Nation when we provide massive increases in arms—in the name of security and stability—and then seek to reduce budget expenditures by holding population assistance to 1979 levels. We ignore the true causes of instability and unrest at the peril of peace.

Mr. President, rapid population growth is outpacing the world's ability to provide the basic necessities of life. While we can take some comfort in the reduction in the annual rate of growth of the world's population—it has slowed to 1.7

percent from the 2 percent of the mid-1960's—we must also be aware that the annual increment to the world's population is increasing. The average annual population increment in the 1960's was 58 million; in the 1970's, at a reduced annual rate of growth, the annual increment was 66 million.

This is extremely significant, because of the inverse relationship between world population growth and world food production—per capita food production is declining. To be sure, we have been remarkably successful in our efforts to increase food production—but at great cost.

The doubling of world grain output since 1950 has entailed land abuse so severe that fully one-fifth and perhaps as much as one-third of the world's cropland is losing topsoil at a rate that is undermining its long-term productivity. The Department of Agriculture reports that the inherent productivity of 34 percent of U.S. cropland is now falling because of the excessive loss of topsoil.

Mr. President, I will not continue. Population problems are urgent, yet funds for population assistance have increased by less than 3 percent since 1979 and now represent in real purchasing power only 66 percent of the funds made available in 1972 when the Congress made population assistance a separate line item.

There are many here who know that I argued in committee for \$240 million in funding. I was not successful, but I hope the full Senate will at least provide the President's revised budget request. I hope the Senate will support my amendment.

Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the subcommittee, and he has assured me that he is willing to accept this amendment.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Hawaii is incorrect. Unfortunately, I am unable to accept this amendment. But he is correct in saying that we have discussed this amendment and that I agree with him that this account is one of great importance to our overall foreign assistance effort. It is an area in which I personally feel our support is deserved.

I would like to advise the distinguished Senator from Hawaii that the House amount of this account is approximately \$50 million higher than our amount. Just to split, if we split the difference in conference, would put us over the President's budget.

I want to assure the Senator that I believe this is an important program. I believe this is a conferenceable item. I know I can assure the Senator that I will carry forward the desires that he has expressed so eloquently, as well as other Members of the Senate who I think are supportive of this program.

I further assure the Senator that the amount which comes out of conference will be a good bit closer, if not almost exactly, the amount which the President has requested and which the Senator from Hawaii is working toward.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, with the assurance of the chairman that this is a conferenceable item, and that he would look with some favorable consideration

upon the President's request in conference, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment (UP No. 636) is withdrawn.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 637

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas (Mrs. KASSEBAUM) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 637.

On page 5, line 23, delete the number "\$680,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$637,485,000."

On page 8, line 5, delete the number "\$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$92,515,000."

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, this amendment reduces the appropriation for the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Nutrition account by \$42,515,000 and increases the Sahel development program account by the same figure. This amendment reduces the Agriculture account to \$637,485,000, the amount requested by the administration, and increases the Sahel development account to \$92,515,000, an amount about \$2 million less than the President requested.

The Sahel is a region of important humanitarian and political concern to the United States. The American people spoke from the heart in the early 1970's, when famine took the lives of thousands of Sahelians. They told the Congress that they could not accept that millions of their fellow human beings lived lives of hungry desperation and were condemned to periodic famine. The Sahel program was a mandate from the American people for a long-term commitment to enable these countries to halt the expansion of the Sahara desert and to achieve food self-sufficiency.

There have been problems with the Sahel program, of that there is no doubt. We must expect to encounter, and to overcome, problems when we made a long term commitment to the Sahel program.

The committee report indicates that there have been problems with the accounting of funds that were entrusted to the local governments. An Inspector General's report—and I would like to emphasize AID's Inspector General—discovered that some money was misused. In that there have been cases where the local governments have not used AID-furnished local currencies for agreed upon activities but for other public purposes. In these instances AID has been seeking and, so far, obtaining restitution. It is seeking to launch, with the funds we are discussing today, programs of technical assistance to train local government officials in better financial management.

In undertaking to assist the development of these countries, which are among the very poorest of nations, it was to be expected that there would be problems of this nature. What Congress has the right to expect as well is that AID will take effective action to solve these problems as they are discovered. I have received assurances from AID that

improvements in the accounting procedures in the Sahelian states are among the highest priorities of the AID program in the region.

I would hope that my colleagues would join with me in this amendment. I have discussed it with the chairman and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. I believe we can hopefully reach an agreement on this. I would appreciate their support.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I would like to say that we have been working with the Senator from Kansas on a number of different issues having to do with the African continent, knowing that she is the very capable subcommittee chairman of the African Affairs Subcommittee.

The Congress has long recognized the importance of providing assistance to the Sahel; and the Appropriations Committee believes that the Sahel development program is an international effort worthy of continued support. However, at a time when the economy of the United States is under considerable stress and major funding cuts have been made in a number of vital domestic programs, it is difficult to support the level of funding the Senator has proposed.

Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator for her work in finding ways to offset this particular account within the overall AID-Sahel development program so that we can increase these funds and put this back to the appropriate level, the appropriate level which the AID and the President have recommended, at the same time staying within the overall budget restraints which we have.

The Senator from Illinois may also want to address this issue.

It would be my intention at the appropriate moment to agree with the Senator from Kansas and to accept her very thoughtful amendment.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add as cosponsors Senator PELL and Senator CHAFEE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I appreciate the remarks of the chairman of the subcommittee. It is not easy, as we are trying to find priorities for our appropriations. I am pleased that we are working at it in such a way that we can shift some funding to secure other funds. I do believe that this region is of major concern.

Mr. PERCY. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I yield.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, with regard to the Sahel program, let me simply quote from recent testimony by AID Administrator Peter McPherson before a House subcommittee. He stated:

Since the Senate Appropriations Committee has proposed reducing the Sahel Development Program to only \$50 million, I would like to take this opportunity to emphasize the importance I attach to this program. We are creating the human and institutional capacity, as well as the research base, that the Sahel needs for food self-sufficiency and self-sustaining development by the end of this century.

Moreover, State Department officials advise me that decreasing the Sahel program to \$50 million would endanger U.S. security interests in West Africa. The Sahel Develop-

ment Program is an important tool for helping the Sahel countries to resist the threat of Libyan takeover.

I am, of course, most concerned with the prudent management of U.S. resources. We are moving rapidly and systematically to deal with weaknesses in financial management systems that have been highlighted by recent audit reports. We have instituted a requirement that AID Mission Directors in the Sahel certify, as a condition for continuing local cost financing under our projects, that adequate host-country accounting systems are in place. We are also launching programs of technical assistance and training to insure that Sahelian management institutions are strengthened. In doing this, we have squarely faced up to a legitimate criticism of the Sahel Program and are dealing with it effectively.

I commend my distinguished colleague from Kansas for offering this amendment. The manager has done a very fine job in managing this bill, and the changes in these accounts would not erode the basic allocations made by his committee. I commend the manager for accepting the amendment.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I commend my colleague from Kansas for her leadership in this area. I ask that my name be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I also would like to say how happy I am that the managers of the bill have agreed to accept this amendment. We have many residents from the Sahel living in my State of Rhode Island. This matter is particularly interesting to those of us who represent Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment (UP No. 637) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 638

(Purpose: To establish a limitation of \$5,065,000,000 on the fiscal year 1982 direct loan program of the Export-Import Bank of the United States)

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 638.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 14, line 23, strike \$4,695,000,000 through \$4,700,000,000 on line 24, and insert in lieu thereof \$5,065,000,000 or more than \$5,065,000,000.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, my amendment would raise the committee's

recommended ceiling on Export-Import Bank direct loans from \$4.7 billion to \$5.1 billion. The amendment would increase budget authority by \$365 million and outlays by less than \$20 million.

In truth, this is not an increase. In fiscal year 1981, Eximbank direct lending authority was \$5,461,000,000. My amendment would reduce this amount by almost \$400 million. I would also note that the ceiling proposed in my amendment is equal to the ceiling adopted by the Congress in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981.

Mr. President, Eximbank loan authorization levels have been projected at a fiscal year level of \$6,710,000,000. Funding of Eximbank direct loans at the \$4.7 billion level recommended by the committee would, therefore, leave a \$2 billion credit gap. I would suggest that, when our country is in a recession, when our trade balance is in deficit, when we are trying to revitalize our Nation's economy, it is not a good time to have a credit gap in export financing.

Faced with rapidly rising imported energy bills, the major exporting countries have been competing more aggressively for export sales. The Congressional Research Service has found that the increasing similarities in price, quality, and availability of developed country goods means that Government financing arrangements have become a determining factor in export sales.

The United States is involved in a heated international trade competition. The governmental credit agencies of foreign nations have become key elements of foreign and economic policy. These agencies aggressively promote the exports of their countries by offering extremely favorable financing to prospective purchasers, particularly on large, high technology products. In 1980, the General Accounting Office produced a study which found that, during 1978, Japan and the United Kingdom supported 35 percent of their exports, France supported 20 percent of its exports, and Germany 12 percent. Only 6 percent of American exports were supported by Eximbank financing.

Mr. President, the proposed cut in direct lending authority reduces our ability to meet foreign credit competition. At the very least, it signals an American withdrawal from aggressive credit competition, and, as a result, weakens our bargaining leverage in future negotiations to eliminate foreign credit subsidies. The Reagan administration is unilaterally disarming the United States in a global credit war.

The Eximbank has been a critical factor in promoting foreign trade. In fiscal year 1980, Eximbank's loans, guarantees, and insurance supported exports of \$18.1 billion, a 33-percent increase over fiscal year 1979. The Department of the Treasury found that at least 70 percent of the \$18.1 billion in exports attributable to Eximbank would not have occurred without Eximbank support. Eximbank helps our international balance of trade.

Mr. President, in fiscal year 1981, Eximbank was funded at \$5.5 billion. Eximbank has already made its budget sacrifice—the \$5.065 billion provided in my

amendment is \$500 million less than the 1981 level. Nonetheless, I do not believe the Senate would support a higher level.

Consequently, I am proposing a somewhat smaller reduction than that proposed by the committee in the hope that the Senate will do its part to encourage expansion of U.S. exports.

Mr. President, I have been assured by the chairman of the subcommittee that every effort will be made to uphold the committee's recommended level in conference.

Am I correct?

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, as the Senator from Hawaii knows, this is the only title in which the subcommittee recommendation and the full committee recommendation is now substantially over the President's request. It is there because there is a strong feeling on the part of the Senate that we do need this kind of assistance as we increase an aggressive export policy.

It is my hope that we can stay as close to the Senate level as possible. I know there is support in this Chamber to go even further than we have now come out of committee. We are substantially over the House number. It will be my very strong intention to stay as close to the Senate number as we can. However, unfortunately, I have to resist the amendment to increase the Eximbank figure.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I am very appreciative of the efforts of the chairman of the subcommittee to bring this in with savings that are necessary, but I should like to speak for a moment to the Export-Import Bank and some of the misconceptions that surround that program.

In the best of worlds, we would not need an Export-Import Bank funding program, but in the reality of the world as it is, we need to give assistance to U.S. manufacturers when they have to compete against subsidized foreign programs. It is not that we are just cutting assistance to large corporate structures if we significantly cut back Ex-Im funding or take it away altogether. What we are talking about, if that should be the case, is a loss of a number of jobs in the United States.

The distinguished Senator from Hawaii gave figures in proportion to the percentages of other countries compared with our own. I should like to give figures that show how Eximbank assists businesses, both large and small.

For example, more than 5,700 firms in all 50 States have received direct Ex-Im assistance.

Boeing alone helped support 3,500 first-tier subcontractors in 44 States, plus another 50,000 second- and third-tier suppliers of materials and services.

Nearly 75 percent of a Westinghouse powerplant project was contributed by than 32,000 exporting jobs in 37 States.

The Bank's 1980 operations supported 720,000 American jobs, using the Government's estimates that for every \$1 billion in exports, 40,000 jobs are supported.

Those are some figures that show the importance of this program, the importance of funding for this program, so that we can be competitive in the international market.

I am appreciative of the efforts of the

chairman of the subcommittee to retain a strong level of funding, and I wish to lend support to his efforts to keep a sound program in place.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Hawaii for their ongoing strong support of this program—particularly the Senator from Kansas, who has been working not only on the floor and in the Foreign Relations Committee but also in the Budget Committee, in a strong effort to support the Exim program.

I am aware of the importance of this program to our exporters. I am aware of international competition. I am aware of the growing amount of predatory financing which is being brought forth by a number of countries, and I am aware of the importance of this particular program. So I assure my colleagues that I will do everything I can to maintain this level, the level we have brought from the full committee, and I will work for a strong Eximbank funding policy.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, with the assurance of strong leadership in our conference with the House in maintaining the committee's position, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment (UP No. 638) is withdrawn.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 634 WITHDRAWN

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which my unprinted amendment No. 634 was adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I withdraw that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment (UP No. 634) is withdrawn.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 639

Mr. KASTEN. Instead, Mr. President, on behalf of Senator PERCY and myself, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTEN), for himself, Mr. PERCY, and Mr. KENNEDY proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 639.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 8, line 19, beginning with "\$2,548,500,000" strike out all through "United States:" on page 9, line 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$2,623,500,000: Provided, That of the funds appropriated under this paragraph not less than \$806,000,000 shall be available for Israel, not less than \$771,000,000 shall be available for Egypt, not less than \$100,000,000 shall be available for Sudan, not less than \$5,000,000 for Poland, not less than \$5,000,000 for Tunisia, and not less than \$15,000,000 for Costa Rica:

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, this amendment essentially takes care of a small misunderstanding that our Appropriations Subcommittee had with the Foreign Relations Committee. I feel very strongly that it is important that we

work in close concert with Chairman PERCY, with the minority and with the staff. We found that it was necessary to make a change in this amendment.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, during consideration of the International Security and Development Corporation Act of 1981, the Senate agreed to \$5 million earmarkings each for Poland and Tunisia and a \$15 million earmarking for Costa Rica. This amendment simply restores those levels already agreed to by the Senate.

The earmarking for Poland would allow U.S. private voluntary agencies to purchase, transport, and distribute food and medical supplies to Poland. These supplies will be badly needed by Poland this winter, and this small U.S. effort will be politically very significant.

The earmarking for Tunisia sustains a badly needed U.S. economic aid program for that country. AID has an excellent record in Tunisia and this program has an especially high payoff. Politically, the program will help prevent social instability that is being stirred up by Tunisia's neighbor—Colonel Qadhafi of Libya. This earmark is essential.

The earmark for Costa Rica provides badly needed economic aid for the showplace for democracy in Central America. Without such aid, Costa Rica's faltering economy could cause problems not unlike those in Nicaragua and El Salvador. This is a wise investment in the future.

EMERGENCY AID FOR POLAND

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last September 23 the Senate approved unanimously an amendment which I introduced, and Senators PERCY and PELL cosponsored together with Senators CRANSTON, BIDEN, TSONGAS, MITCHELL, and LUGAR, authorizing \$5 million in emergency relief assistance for Poland.

Today I am pleased to cosponsor with Senators KASTEN and PERCY an amendment which will insure that these funds are appropriated without any restrictions for Poland—in addition to funds for Costa Rica and Tunisia—as originally envisioned by the Senate.

I believe that at this critical time when millions of Poles must face the harsh winter without sufficient coal to heat their homes, without sufficient food to feed their families, without sufficient medicine for their sick, it would be unconscionable to place restrictions on desperately needed humanitarian assistance.

Over the past year the Polish people have struggled to achieve new and important freedoms. The right to form independent trade and farm unions, the right to vote by a truly secret ballot, the right of local managers and workers to participate in the economic decision-making process—all these rights are unique in the Soviet bloc, and the Polish people continue to show their determination to defend these gains of the past year.

But Poland's deteriorating economic situation threatens this hard-won progress, as well as the very stability of the nation. The people of Poland hear the promise of future freedom and prosperity, but they must wait in line for food, clothing, and gasoline for hours on end,

only to be told that there is no more. They are told that they must lower the temperature in their homes to 55° Fahrenheit, so that Poland can export its coal to earn hard currency for its debt.

We cannot solve all of Poland's economic problems but we must try to make a difference where we can. And one area of acute shortages where our assistance can literally make the difference between life and death is the area of drugs and medical supplies.

The Polish people are facing a severe health care emergency. Polish industry is presently unable to produce the quantity of medicines and essential medical supplies necessary to the health and well-being of its people. Even very basic items are in short supply—everything from aspirin to antibiotics, from tongue depressors to syringes is largely unavailable. And perhaps the most vulnerable victims of these shortages are the children, whose resistance to disease is further diminished by nutritional deficiencies caused by chronic food shortages.

I have been in close touch with members of the Polish-American Congress and the Solidarity labor union, as well as with the Polish Ambassador regarding this issue. All agree that we can make a difference. Project HOPE is currently sponsoring a drive to relieve Poland's critical medical emergency through donated drugs and supplies from American pharmaceutical firms, which are distributed to the Polish hospitals free of charge by Solidarity and the Polish Ministry of Health. This established network can be geared toward the children of Poland by insuring that the American Children's Hospital in Krakow, which is administered by HOPE with AID funds, is kept well supplied.

The United States should proceed rapidly to provide this desperately needed medical and related emergency assistance to the people of Poland. By supporting the appropriations amendment before us today, the Senate will confirm its unanimous support for our foreign aid authorization for Poland last September. I look forward to working with members of the conference committee and the administration in insuring that these funds are used effectively in the areas of greatest need in Poland.●

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (UP No. 639) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments?

UP AMENDMENT NO. 640

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I send an unprinted amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTEN) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 640.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 17, line 22, insert in lieu of the figure "\$2,500" the figure "\$4,000"; and

On page 17, line 23, insert in lieu of the figure "\$140,000" the figure "\$138,500".

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, this amendment is of a technical nature. The committee agreed to a request by the administration to increase representation and entertainment expenses for the Department of Defense in connection with the foreign military assistance program. We provided most of the request, but they have informed us that they would like a slightly different breakdown between the entertainment expenses and representational allowance. This amendment complies with that request. It is my understanding that Senator INOUE has had an opportunity to review the request and agrees with it.

Mr. INOUE. I am always pleased to agree with my colleague.

Mr. KASTEN. I thank the Senator for his cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (UP No. 640) was agreed to.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 641

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTEN) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 641.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 16, strike the language on lines 10 through 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 502. Except for the appropriations entitled 'International disaster assistance', 'United States emergency refugee and migration assistance fund' and the special requirements fund within the appropriations entitled 'Military Assistance' and the special requirements fund within the appropriations entitled 'Economic support fund,' not more than 15 per centum of any appropriation item made available by this Act for the fiscal year 1982 shall be obligated or reserved during the last month of availability."

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, this amendment corrects an oversight by the committee with respect to its requirement that not more than 15 percent of any appropriation item made be made available during the last month of the fiscal year. The exceptions to this have been the various contingency or disaster related accounts, and because the committee has decided to appropriate funds for special requirements funds under the economic support fund and the MAP program, we should therefore add those two programs as exceptions under this section.

I understand that Senator INOUE has no problem with this, as it is a technical change.

Mr. INOUE. It is a good amendment.

Mr. KASTEN. I thank the Senator for his help and cooperation.

I move adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment (UP No. 641) was agreed to.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 642

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I send an unprinted amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTEN) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 642.

On page 3, line 12, in lieu of the figure "\$1,678,305,878" insert the figure "\$1,687,728,491".

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, this is a technical amendment adjusting the callable capital figure for the World Bank so that it conforms with the amounts provided in paid-in capital to the special capital increase and the general capital increase of the World Bank. The old figure reflected a different breakdown between these two replenishments.

Once more, it is my understanding that the Senator from Hawaii has had an opportunity to review this amendment, and he agrees with it.

Mr. INOUE. My chairman is correct.

Mr. KASTEN. I thank the ranking minority Member for his help and cooperation.

I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment (UP No. 642) was agreed to.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 643

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators PERCY and SARBANES, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTEN) on behalf of Mr. PERCY and Mr. SARBANES proposes unprinted amendment numbered 643.

On page 13, line 17, delete the number "\$3,063,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof the number "\$3,083,500,000".

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I note that the Senator from Maryland is here in the Chamber, and I yield to him to speak on behalf of this amendment.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, I am very pleased to join the distinguished Senator from Illinois, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in introducing this amendment.

The additional \$20 million in FMS credits for Greece will bring the appropriation for this purpose in the current fiscal year to the level authorized by the Foreign Relations Committee thereby keeping military aid to Greece and Turkey proportionately the same as in fiscal year 1981. It will have no effect on budget outlays. It is, however, a very sig-

nificant and constructive step reaffirming established U.S. policy with respect to Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean since section 620C(b) (4) of the Foreign Assistance Act states that U.S. security assistance "shall be designed to insure that the present balance of military strength among countries of the region, including Greece and Turkey is preserved."

Adoption of this amendment will carry forward and indeed reinforce the solid working relationship between the United States and Greece. The peoples of the United States and Greece are joined by historic and traditional ties that reach back to the early days of the two countries, and these ties are cemented by a mutual commitment to democratic principles and the rule of law. The amendment proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois and myself reflects the importance attached to maintaining and strengthening that relationship, and contributes to that end.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, this amendment would increase the foreign military credit sales ceiling by \$20 million.

As I understand the Senator's intent, he is suggesting that this add-on be made available for Greece. The amendment is aimed at the ceiling guarantee level, thus it has no budgetary affect.

Mr. President, I support this amendment. It is my understanding that the amendment has been reviewed and agreed by the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. I am pleased to join in the support.

Mr. KASTEN. I, therefore, am pleased to accept it on behalf of the majority and the minority of our committee.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KASTEN. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am very pleased to join together with the distinguished Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) on this amendment which does add \$20 million in foreign military sales financing for Greece.

This increase would provide \$280 million for Greece which preserves the 7 to 10 ratio of military aid between Turkey and Greece.

There is no budget impact to this increase since FMS financing is off-budget. The loans are made at the cost of money to the U.S. Government.

The full \$280 million was previously authorized by the Senate and is especially important to Greece at a time when a new government is taking office. By taking this action at this time, the Senate can send a signal to the new government in Greece that the United States wants to work together with Greece to help it preserve its security.

I might say parenthetically that I have been very disturbed by the newspaper reports of the anti-American attitude expressed by the crowds outside the Embassy in Greece.

We are not trying to say that this particular program is an answer to that. It was done long before those outcries. We in this country understand dissent as well as any other country. Here they have

democracy working. They have the right to be anti-American or pro-American, whatever they want.

But the continuing policy that we are pursuing in this country and in this Congress is to show our good faith, to show our friendship with the people of Greece, the interdependence that we have with the people of Greece, and I believe that our record through the years will support those who in Greece believe that close ties between the United States of America—its Government and its people—and Greece, is in the best interests of both countries and the free world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment (UP No. 643) was agreed to.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be proposed?

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 644

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) for himself and Mr. PELL, proposes unprinted amendment numbered 644.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 5, line 7, delete the number "\$216,138,000" and add in lieu thereof "\$218,638,000".

On page 5, line 12 delete the number "\$5,000,000" and add in lieu thereof "\$7,500,000".

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, this amendment increases the amount available for the United Nations Environment program by \$2.5 million. The authorizing bill passed by the Senate earmarks \$10 million for UNEP. The appropriations bill currently allocates only \$5 million for this program. This amendment splits the difference between these two earmarks.

I believe that the managers of the bill have agreed to accept this amendment.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, the amendment suggested by Senator PERCY would add another \$2.5 million for the United Nations environment program.

I would like to point out that the committee was very generous with this Institution. We are recommending the appropriation of \$5 million, \$3 million or 150 percent more than the budget request.

The committee took this position despite our deep concern over two problems which have plagued this institution. The first problem has been consistent reports that the professional staff of UNEP is all but in open revolt with management. The second, more well known problem, was that institution's blatantly political action in turning down the low bid for construction of its headquarters building because the low bidder was an Israeli construction firm.

While under the circumstances I believe our recommendation is adequate and justifiable, I also recognize the Senator feels strongly about this, and I would like his assurance that his committee will look into some of these problems with the management of this Institution. The position of support taken by the subcommittee was in spite of deep concern over these two problems that have plagued this Institution.

Under these circumstances, our subcommittee was not in any way pleased or satisfied with the direction that this Institution was taking, and we sought in our hearings to demonstrate our strong concern.

I agree to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois reluctantly, but in my agreement I ask that he assure us that his committee will work with us and look into the problems that I have just spoken of because I know that the Senator does not wish to condone this kind of poor management and blatant political consideration.

If you can assure us that you will join with us in trying to solve some of the management problems of this agency I would reluctantly agree to your \$2.5 million amendment for the U.N. environment program.

Mr. PERCY. I want to express concern also, and say that I share the Senator's concern, and can pledge to him that the Committee on Foreign Relations will fully look into this matter and advise the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin as to our findings.

Mr. KASTEN. With that understanding, we will go forward on this particular project, and I can assure the Senator we will do so together. Our concerns are mutual. Under those circumstances I will support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment (UP No. 644) was agreed to.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KASTEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

THE INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, I am concerned about the way in which S. 1802

deals with the U.S. payment to the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) in fiscal year 1982.

Let me begin with a bit of historical background about IFAD. IFAD was created in response to a recommendation of the World Food Conference in 1974.

It resulted directly from a proposal by the OPEC countries, which was actively supported by the United States. It was established in 1977 as a United Nations specialized agency, beginning operations in December of that year.

The United States made a generous contribution to IFAD of \$200 million for the initial 3-year period, 1978-80. Other developed countries contributed \$370 million, for a total of \$570 million from the developed country side. OPEC contributions totaled \$430 million for the initial 3-year period.

The issue before the Senate now is the level of the U.S. payment to IFAD for fiscal year 1982. The Senate has already passed the fiscal year 1982 foreign aid authorization bill, which includes a U.S. contribution to the replenishment of \$180 million, of which no more than \$45 million is to be made available in fiscal year 1982. S. 1802 as reported provides no payment in fiscal year 1982, leaving open the question of possible U.S. payments in fiscal year 1983 and fiscal year 1984.

In view of our historic support for IFAD, it troubles me that the United States would defer any contribution to the replenishment until at least fiscal year 1983—that is, October 1, 1982.

It is my understanding that the chairman of the subcommittee has three specific problems with making a U.S. contribution to the IFAD replenishment in fiscal year 1982. The first has to do with how much of the funding load is to be borne by the OECD—Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—countries, including the United States, and how much by OPEC nations. The second problem has to do with the size of the IFAD staff, and the third concern has to do with the question of whether or not IFAD's unique mission still exists.

On the subject of cost-sharing, the original plan for IFAD was that the OECD-OPEC funding ratio was to be 50 to 50. The initial funding was 57 to 43, OECD-OPEC, and in the replenishment, the ratio would be 58 to 42. This is movement in the wrong direction, and we should do everything possible to reverse that direction and reestablish a 50 to 50 ratio. At the same time, we must be careful not to jeopardize or overlook the fact that \$180 million in U.S. participation is leveraging \$440 million from other OECD countries and \$350 million from OPEC.

There is some question about whether or not OPEC is actively working to bring its contribution up to \$450 million. The committee report expresses concern that that decision will not come until next summer. There are new indications from the President of IFAD that a decision may in fact be reached later this month. If this happens, some of the credit belongs to the Senator from Wisconsin for his diligence and concern in this matter.

However, if this should occur, I would hope that a way could be found for us to respond in kind.

On the subject of professional staff size, I understand that at its origin IFAD was to have no more than 30 people. I am the last person to endorse bigger staffs, nor do I claim to be an expert on IFAD's staff needs. However, I am told that the administration has already initiated discussions with IFAD officials and other governments along the lines of the IFAD staff limit of 75 called for in the foreign aid authorization bill. I would hope this development could resolve this problem.

With regard to the final problem of IFAD's mission, I, too, would like to see an emphasis on the rural poor and on having IFAD work through other institutions rather than set up its own programs. I am not sure, however, that the record on this point is as "dismal" as the committee suggests.

Recent reports on IFAD—both the one done by our own GAO and one by the U.S. International Development Cooperation Agency, November 1980—credit IFAD with directing its resources toward the poorest countries and their small farmers. Individual IFAD projects have also been credited with introducing basic changes which have benefited small farmers in various countries.

I guess the real question is to what extent the entire program is put at risk with our failure to provide funds in fiscal year 1982. I am told that IFAD's president believes that the whole financial package would collapse if we do not meet our commitments.

It seems to me that the nature of this program, the emphasis on small farming, and the funding support from OPEC and other nations are very important concepts which should not be jeopardized. I am aware that the IFAD replenishment received considerable attention at the Cancun summit, which concluded, and I quote, that—

IFAD requires prompt replenishment of its resources so that it may continue its operations without interruption.

The administration support for IFAD is clear, if not as visible as some of us would like. They sought \$45 million early this year. That figure was adjusted downward to \$39.6 million in the revised September budget. I would like to read a letter I received today from AID Administrator Peter McPherson reaffirming the administration support:

Hon. JOHN C. DANFORTH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DANFORTH: I am writing to you to make clear the Administration's position with regard to funding for the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). Most recently, Administration support for IFAD has been manifested in a request of \$180 million as the United States' contribution to the replenishment of IFAD, with a first installment of \$39.6 million to be appropriated for FY 1982.

The Administration's request was accepted by both the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees. However, the Senate Committee adopted a Sense of Congress provision which noted its concern over the failure of OPEC countries to provide at least half of the contributions to IFAD, as

well as over certain staffing and implementation problems. The Senate Appropriations Committee also looked closely at these issues and felt, without foreclosing the possibility of funding for FY 1983, that they warranted closer examination before the Committee would be willing to appropriate funds. Thus, the Committee recommended that no funds be made available for IFAD for FY 1982.

I believe there is now greater appreciation on the part of IFAD as to the seriousness with which the Congress views these funding and organizational issues. We will, of course, continue to work with IFAD to assure that its original purposes can be met in a manner consistent with its prior commitments to the United States and other donors.

Of course, any action you might take during consideration by the Senate of the foreign assistance appropriation bill which is consistent with the President's request, would receive our support.

Sincerely,

M. PETER MCPHERSON.

In light of all this, it would be a great tragedy if the United States was perceived as the country that jeopardized this program's future, especially in light of positive signals received recently from OPEC.

It is my understanding that that is not the case. I am assured that in fiscal year 1983 the door is open for the United States to meet its funding commitment. I hope that the door is not closed for fiscal year 1982 if OPEC shows a willingness to meet its commitment and the other IFAD problems are resolved.

At any rate, OPEC and the other IFAD funding participants should know of the continuing U.S. commitment toward IFAD's goals and objectives.

I have been asked by Senators HATFIELD, LEAHY, EAGLETON, PERCY, and PELL, to express their support for these same sentiments.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I would simply like to state to the Senate and to the Senator from Missouri that the door is always open.

In his comments he pointed out that we have decided to defer funding for IFAD, and I might also remind the Senator from Missouri that the Arab countries have deferred their decision, as well, until next summer.

But our action is not meant to indicate to anyone that the door is closed on this question or that we do not look with favor and interest upon this program if the commitments of the other member countries are, in fact, met.

CYPRUS

Mr. PERCY. On page 9, lines 2 and 3 of S. 1802, the committee bill would provide that "not more than \$7.5 million shall be available for Cyprus." The International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1981 earmarks not less than \$10 million for Cyprus.

I would note that in the Foreign Relations Committee markup a figure of \$15 million was first considered, so that the \$10 million earmark is already a compromise figure.

These funds would be used not only for refugee assistance but also for educational exchange. The \$10 million figure in the authorizing bill represents a \$5 million reduction from fiscal year 1981.

I understand that the continuing resolution in the House bill would provide \$15 million for Cyprus in fiscal year 1982.

Would it therefore be fair to assume that the conference report for the continuing resolution would provide at least \$10 million for Cyprus and that it could be earmarked with language similar to that on page 9, lines 2-3 of S. 1802?

Mr. KASTEN. I believe that given the levels and earmarking for Cyprus in this bill and in the House continuing resolution that the assumption of the Senator from Illinois may well be correct.

Mr. PERCY. I thank my distinguished colleague very much indeed.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 645

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 645:

On page 9, lines 22 to 25, delete everything after the number \$34,160,000.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators PELL and BIDEN be added as cosponsors to this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PERCY. The amount to be appropriated as recommended by the Appropriations Committee reduces the President's revised request by about \$2.5 million for international narcotics control.

Personally, I disagree with a reduction in this all important program to keep illegal drugs off America's streets, but I will not contest the reduction.

Although I imagine it makes Senator NUNN and other members of the Permanent Investigating Committee, who have spent so much time with me on drug abuse, unhappy when we look at the cost effectiveness of efforts that we make to try to reduce drug abuse in this country, and we recognize the tremendous cost of drug abuse running into the billions of dollars alone just on street crime. Anything we can do to reduce drug abuse is cost effective in my judgment.

This amendment deletes the prohibition on funds to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control. This program is aimed primarily at Pakistan. Now I understand that there may be some temporary absorption problems with UNFDAC, but this is no reason to prohibit funds for that program. Such a prohibition will be read in Pakistan as a sign that we are no longer interested in controlling the flow of illegal drugs from that area. I should think that simply reducing the funds for UNFDAC is sufficient and no prohibition is required. The President needs some flexibility in this area.

The Foreign Relations Committee has received a letter from the administration stating that no funds would be obligated for UNFDAC in fiscal year 1982 unless Congress receives a reprogramming notice. I ask unanimous consent that that letter be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, D.C., November 12, 1981.

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations,
Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In discussions which were held this afternoon between Mr. James Bond of the Senate Appropriations Committee Staff and Mr. Hans Binnendijk of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee staff with Mr. Joseph H. Linnemann of the Bureau of International Narcotics Matters, Mr. Linnemann requested that the prohibitive language restricting the use of funds for the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control be dropped from S. 1802.

If this can be done, the Administration would make a thorough review of our UNFDAC program needs and before proceeding to obligate any funds for this purpose the Bureau through the Department would submit a Notice of our Intention to Reprogram to both the Senate and the House of Representatives pursuant to Section 634 of the Foreign Assistance Act.

I hope this proposal is acceptable to you.

Sincerely,

RICHARD FAIRBANKS,
Assistant Secretary
for Congressional Relations.

Mr. PERCY. With this assurance I do believe this amendment may be acceptable to the managers of the bill.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, concern has been expressed by Senators PERCY, D'AMATO and others regarding the committee's action which cut funding for the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control and put in the bill language prohibiting funding for that program.

The reason for the committee's action is that in the hearings we discovered that the pipeline for the U.N. fund remains quite large, and it is obvious that the program does not need any new funds. That situation has not changed.

However, I do understand the concern that has been expressed with reference to the prohibition which we have put in the legislation, and I am, therefore, willing to accept the amendment dropping the prohibition. However, it is nonetheless understood that the cut that we made to the program includes the cut from the U.N. fund. This is not going to hurt this program, as, in fact, they have already indicated that they intended to use money budgeted for the U.N. fund as a contingency fund for bilateral programs. Even now there is a reprogramming pending which would use one of the \$2 million available for the U.N. fund for a program in Mexico.

I am pleased that the Senator has asked that the letter from Mr. Richard Fairbanks, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, be included in the RECORD. This letter indicates that the Department will not go forward with any funding for UNFDAC unless a reprogramming is submitted in the normal reprogramming fashion.

So with that understanding, I accept the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. I thank my distinguished colleague very much indeed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment (UP No. 645) was agreed to.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KASTEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 646

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) for himself and Mr. PELL proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 646.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 19 line 12, after the word "Committees," insert the words "and the relevant authorizing committees".

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the current provision of section 512 requires that the Appropriations Committee approve any transfers of funds between appropriation accounts.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has informally received assurances from the administration that it would receive the same treatment concerning such transfers as does the Appropriations Committee.

This amendment simply formalizes that arrangement.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, section 512 of this bill has been carried in the appropriation legislation for several years. It provides that transfers may not be made between accounts without the prior approval of the Appropriations Committees.

This amendment would add the authorizing committees to that approval process. While the authorizing committees are, of course, entitled to require such approval in its own legislation, I have no objection to including them here, and, therefore, on behalf of the majority, I am willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment (UP No. 646) was agreed to.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KASTEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on page 8, lines 11 to 12 of the bill there is deleted all funding for the African Development Foundation. I address this question to my distinguished colleagues, the managers of the bill. As you know, this program was authorized at the initiation and the initiative of the House of Representatives. I do not intend to move to delete this prohibition, but just simply

I want the record to show that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations supports the African Development Foundation.

I hope that between now and the conference we can discuss this program, and if you become convinced of its merits I hope you can recede to the House's position on this issue.

Mr. KASTEN. In response to the question of the Senator from Illinois, I would hope that we could, in fact, between now and the conference discuss this program. I would be more than anxious to do so. If, as the Senator says, we become convinced of the merits, we could certainly consider working with the House on this particular issue.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague very much.

I would like to add that it is my understanding that the distinguished chairperson of the African Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator KASSEBAUM, is supportive of this position, as well.

I was interested to note that the committee's report discusses the claim of the Sea Oil & General Co. against the Government of Indonesia. I am a strong supporter of American investors abroad, and I commend the committee for its efforts to resolve this longstanding dispute. At the same time, we have vital strategic and economic interests in Indonesia. I am concerned that the language of the report, directing that no funds be obligated for assistance to Indonesia until the claim is settled, will jeopardize these interests. Perhaps we can arrive at a different approach which will stimulate a settlement of the claim without posing such a serious risk to our interests in Indonesia.

Mr. KASTEN. The committee was disturbed by the continued lack of progress toward a resolution of the case. It was our intention to send an unmistakable message to the Government of Indonesia that Indonesia cannot expect U.S. assistance to continue unless it respects the rights of U.S. investors. At the same time, I share the Senator's concern regarding the vital interests of the United States in Indonesia. I am hopeful that the case can be settled promptly and that we will therefore avoid any interruption of assistance to Indonesia.

Mr. PERCY. I share the Senator's hope for prompt settlement, but I am concerned that even with the best of intentions, settlement may not be possible before the Foreign Assistance Act becomes law. The case is by no means one-sided. It involves complex issues of fact and law. If we attempt to force a settlement within a relatively short period under a threat that assistance may be terminated, we may drive the Indonesians into an extreme position and thus lessen or eliminate the possibility of a settlement.

Under these circumstances, the claim would remain unsettled and our interests in Indonesia would be severely damaged. I support the committee's efforts to reach a settlement, but I believe the approach reflected in the report may be counterproductive because it threatens an extreme sanction in the very near future.

Mr. KASTEN. The case has dragged on for several years without substantial progress toward settlement. Under these circumstances, the committee felt that strong action was required.

Mr. PERCY. The Senator is correct in noting that progress toward settlement has been extremely slow in the past. Within the last month, however, the Government of Indonesia has retained the law firm of White & Case to examine the case and to advise the Government regarding its resolution. I have been informed that the Washington office of White & Case is actively pursuing the case and expects to make its recommendations to the Government of Indonesia in the near future. At the same time, the Department of State, obviously responding to the committee's expressed concerns, has urged the Government of Indonesia at the highest levels to resolve this matter in order to avoid serious damage to our relations. The Indonesians have replied that they are doing their utmost to resolve the case and will act promptly upon the recommendation of their lawyers. One possibility would be the submission of the case to arbitration. I believe that progress toward a resolution of this claim is finally underway, due in large measure to the committee's strong expression of concern. I fear, however, that if the directive contained in the committee's report becomes effective, it may destroy the current impetus toward a settlement.

Mr. KASTEN. I am encouraged by the Senator's remarks. I believe it is important for the Senate to express its strong and continuing interest in a resolution of this case. At the same time, I appreciate the Senator's concern that our efforts in this regard not be counterproductive. Can the Senator suggest an approach which will effectively promote a settlement without risking the disadvantages he fears may result in the committee's directive?

Mr. PERCY. I recommend for the Senator's consideration the approach taken by the Appropriation's Committee of the House in its report on the same bill. The House report "urges the State Department to press for an immediate settlement and to delay obligation of funds in fiscal year 1982 until a full report has been made to the committee and discussions held." I believe this language reflects the strong concern which this body has regarding the continued lack of a settlement, but provides sufficient latitude and time for the resolution of the claim either through negotiations or arbitration. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. KASTEN. I believe the approach taken by the House may be acceptable. However, given the delays which have occurred in the past, I believe it is necessary to monitor the case very closely and to press for a prompt resolution of the claim.

Mr. PERCY. I share the Senator's concern, and I expect the State Department to take all available measures to promote a settlement and to keep the committee fully and completely informed of the status of this case.

Mr. KASTEN. With that understanding, I may be able to support the approach taken by the House Appropria-

tions Committee, providing the case is resolved, or if substantial progress toward resolution of the case is made.

Mr. PERCY. I thank the Senator for his patience and consideration, and I offer my full support of his efforts to resolve this case.

Mr. President, that concludes the items the Senator from Illinois intended to bring up. I will remain in the vicinity of the floor in the event other items do come up on which the comments of the Senator from Illinois would be necessary.

I see another distinguished member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator HELMS, in the Chamber. I do not always give him my proxy, but I always value his counsel and advice.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair and I thank the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I might say, Mr. President, that I just left a rat race called the conference between the House and the Senate on the farm bill. I see the distinguished occupant of the chair smiling, because he is also a member of that conference. But he could not be there because he has to be here presiding so he does not know the fun he missed, but I will tell him about it.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 647

(Purpose: To prohibit the availability of funds for the United Nations Institute for Namibia)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 647.

On page 5, line 13, before the period insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be available for the United Nations Institute for Namibia".

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the appropriation bill includes \$500 million of the American taxpayers' funds for the so-called Institute for Namibia, to be funded through the voluntary contributions to the United Nations.

Mr. President, at this very moment some delicate negotiations are in progress with regard to the terms for an election for the independence of Namibia. The United Nations has designated SWAPO, a terrorist organization, as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia, even though SWAPO has never participated in an election in Namibia, and in fact refuses to do so. SWAPO believes that power comes out of the barrel of a gun, or maybe out of United Nations support.

One of the sticking points in the proposed election arrangements is whether or not the United Nations should oversee the elections, and provide peace-keeping troops during the election process. But South Africa has rejected these proposals, correctly asserting that the United Nations does not come into the

election process with clean hands. The United Nations, by designating SWAPO, that terrorist group, as the representative of the people of Namibia, has already taken sides in the dispute.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the United Nations—and this is no surprise to anybody who has observed the United Nations over the years—the United Nations has been funding SWAPO for years through various devices, such as the Institute for Namibia, the Fund for Namibia, and various so-called humanitarian and educational organizations.

Mr. President, let the record be clear that the Institute for Namibia is a Marxist organization, intended to indoctrinate its students in the principles of Marxism and revolution. Our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from California (Mr. HAYAKAWA) has told us on more than one occasion on this floor how, during his visit to the institute, the walls were adorned with pictures of Marx and Lenin.

Moreover, the State Department has acknowledged in the past that the Institute caters only to SWAPO members, and that members of other political factions have been literally driven out. In 1979, the then Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations, Mr. Charles Maynes, acknowledged in a letter to me that even the bulk of the members of SWANU, which is SWAPO's revolutionary competitor, had withdrawn from the Institute because of harassment from SWAPO. Needless to say, there have been no moderate students at the Institute whatsoever.

So the purpose of this amendment is, I hope, obvious. It is more than the \$500,000 that is involved. What is involved is the question of what will happen if we continue to fund this outfit. Obviously, we will prejudice the negotiations to which I alluded earlier and we will contribute to the impression that the United Nations is an biased intervenor in what should be a free political process.

Frankly, Mr. President, I am deeply disturbed that this funding should remain in a bill approved by the Reagan administration. I do not believe the President himself knows one thing about this. Even though this may involve what amounts to a small sum of money around this place—\$500,000—it is a significant sum to the American taxpayers, and the political impact of its inclusion in this bill would be all out of proportion to the size of the amount.

So, Mr. President, the pending amendment simply provides that none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be available for the United Nations Institute for Namibia. It would not reduce the overall funding, but it would prevent any U.S. contributions to the Institute.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement and insertions of October 12, 1979, when we last took up this subject, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEADING FUNDS FOR THE INSTITUTE OF NAMIBIA

[Friday, October 12, 1979]

AMENDMENT NO. 512

(Purpose: To prohibit funding for the Institute for Namibia)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina numbered 512.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the pending amendment is very simple. It would cut one-half million dollars from the so-called voluntary contributions to the United Nations intended for the U.N. Institute for Namibia.

Let us take a good close look at this institute. It is an educational arm of the Soviet-backed terrorist organization, SWAPO. I think it is an insult to the American taxpayer to even contemplate using U.S. funds for this purpose.

The U.S. funding is just one increment, however, of millions of dollars which the United Nations intends to funnel into this institute over the next 3 years.

In a recent letter to me, the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Mr. Charles Maynes, has virtually confirmed that the so-called Institute for Namibia is nothing in this world but a SWAPO front. Although the Secretary attempts to make a distinction between military activities and educational activities, the fact remains that a grant to this institute is a grant to support SWAPO's revolutionary activity. I intended to go into more detail about this letter in a moment. Hopefully, it will help my colleagues to understand better the enormous range of funding which the United Nations provides to SWAPO, which it regards as "the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people."

Mr. President, to that the Senator from North Carolina says "horseradish," because the truth is that SWAPO has no legitimate claim to represent the Namibian people, except the claim of terror. By funding SWAPO, the United States will make it impossible to have free elections in Namibia. There is a whole range of political groups in Namibia, both black and multiracial, who are dedicated to democratic principle; but SWAPO rejects democratic principles. Yet it is proposed under this bill to send U.S. taxpayers' money to the aid of SWAPO. A good example is described by Secretary Maynes himself, where he relates how SWAPO forced other political groups to leave the Institute.

I do not believe that the United States can be a party to funding even the educational arm of a terrorist group that rejects democratic principles.

It is understandable why the anti-American bloc at the U.N. should support such programs; but it is incomprehensible why the United States should support them.

The fact is that even though these programs are allegedly "educational" they in fact support the terrorist programs of Marxist revolutionaries in southern Africa. The United Nations has declared SWAPO to be the sole and authentic representatives of the people of Namibia and South Africa. They did this on the basis of the groups' terrorist activities and not upon any realistic assessment of the political strength of the organizations. It is clear Marxist dogma that a Marxist organization is the authentic representative of the people whether the people agree with it or not. It is the same doctrinaire drive for control that proclaims that Gus Hall's Communist Party of the U.S.A. is the authentic representative of the American people. Anybody who believes that will believe anything.

Since the U.N. has already proclaimed SWAPO to be the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia, to take

just one example, SWAPO has become the beneficiary of millions of dollars of U.N. funding. These funds come from both assessed and voluntary contributions. In the bill before us today, we are dealing only with voluntary contributions, but no one can get the true picture without looking at both.

According to an article which appeared last year in the publication *American Relations*, the U.N. has set up three special agencies to support revolution in southern Africa. These include the U.N. Commissioner for Namibia, the U.N. Council for Namibia, and the U.N. Fund for Namibia, which in turn funds the Namibia Institute, which is what this amendment addresses. According to the article, the U.N. Commissioner for Namibia is the U.N.'s government in exile for Namibia, with three offices in New York, Lusaka, and Botswana, with a total budget of \$1,722,500, for 1978-79. The U.N. Council for Namibia has 25 member nations with a budget of \$1,581,700 for 1978-79. The Council also recognizes SWAPO as the "sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia," and funds SWAPO's New York office to the tune of \$182,200.

The U.N. Fund for Namibia is a trust fund account established in 1971, which has received \$950,000 from the assessed U.N. budget, and \$1,303,874 from voluntary contributions. In 1974, the U.N. General Assembly approved the establishment of the Institute for Namibia. The Fund for Namibia gave the Institute \$846,549 by March 1977. However, the United Nations Development Fund also gave the Institute \$3,750,000 from voluntary contributions.

It is the category of voluntary contributions that we are talking about here.

Concerned about the funding of such outfits at the Institute for Namibia, I wrote to the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations Affairs, Mr. Charles Maynes, about the veracity of these figures and other information I had received. Secretary Maynes confirmed them both in outline and detail and added even more disturbing information. A complete copy of Secretary Maynes' letter is on the desk for every Senator. We had it distributed last night and it is here again this afternoon, and I hope Senators will take a look at it.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the letter of Secretary Maynes and its attachments be printed in the *Record* at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HELMS. In response to my questions, Secretary Maynes wrote:

"All of the Institute's students are Namibians. The bulk of them appear to be members or supporters of SWAPO. However, some of the students are also supporters of another Namibian liberation movement, SWANU, and some profess no political preference whatever. Professional staff members are listed on an enclosed table and are citizens of a variety of countries."

I am quoting, Mr. President, and I continue to quote the Secretary:

"Acting on behalf of the President, and after a careful review of our Embassy in Lusaka, Secretary Vance determined on February 6, 1979, that no fiscal year 1979 funds for the UN Institute for Namibia will be used to support the military or paramilitary activities of SWAPO. Although it is clear that there are some members of the faculty at the Institute who favor SWAPO and have expressed their preferences, these expressions, as well as those by groups who favor other political parties, have occurred within a climate of academic freedom that permits a range of political expression as well as the right to keep silent. There have been inci-

dents between supporters of SWAPO and SWANU at the Institute. As a result of one incident a group of SWANU supporters left the Institute. However, our Embassy in Lusaka, maintains frequent contacts with the Institute, believes that these incidents have not affected the integrity of the Institute's academic program."

All that I just read was a precise quote from the Secretary's letter.

Mr. President, I am bound to ask has any Senator ever heard of such nonsense?

Here we have a case where the Secretary, Mr. Maynes, admits that "the bulk of the students appear to be members or supporters of SWAPO." Then he goes on to speak of what he calls "incidents"—and I hope the reporter will put quotation marks around the word "incidents"—where the climate of repression became so great the the minority organization, SWANU, had to leave the Institute. Can any Senator in his right mind vote to send a half million dollars to an outfit like that? Five hundred thousand dollars of the American taxpayers' money.

We are going to see momentarily. But what kind of double talk is this about "academic freedom" from the Secretary?

Mr. President, I believe the facts of the matter are somewhat different. Let us nail down one thing forever more: SWAPO is a terrorist organization which murders innocent people, destroys property, and all the rest of it. SWAPO has chosen to declare war against the black people of Namibia. It has even declared war against those who even dissent within the SWAPO movement. Oh, that is great academic freedom; \$500,000 of the taxpayers' money to support an outfit like that. How absurd can we get?

The head of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, had the dissenters arrested and imprisoned in Zambia. Oh, what a great fellow. By all means we ought to send him \$500,000 of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, Senators had better not take a poll among the American people on this question.

He had the dissenters arrested and thrown in jail, and when a writ of habeas corpus was brought on behalf of these prisoners—you know, the ones who disagreed with the terrorists—this man, Sam Nujoma, had them spirited across the border to Tanzania, where the Tanzanian Marxist dictator, Jules Nyerere, has no compunction about legal niceties. He is not troubled about academic freedom and liberty. Oh, no. About 2,000 SWAPO dissenters have disappeared into Nyerere's jails and have never been seen again.

I will amend that. About 150 were released last year. That leaves 1,850 people who are either dead or locked in some dark prison cell because they committed the heinous crime of dissenting within SWAPO, the terrorist outfit.

Among those 150 were Andreas Chipanga, one of the original founders of SWAPO, and Dr. Kenneth Abrahams, a distinguished medical doctor with an international reputation. You see, they had committed the unpardonable sin of establishing a new political party, the SWAPO-Democrats, a party which rejects the terrorist tactics of Nujoma. Politically, they would be similar to the British Labor Party or the German Social Democrats.

Similarly, SWANU has joined a group called the Namibia National Front, a coalition of parties with a leftist orientation. Although SWAPO, SWAPO-D, and SWANU reject ethnic concepts of politics, the truth is that their base of support is tribal, coming mainly from the Ovambo and Herero tribes. None of them has any authentic claim to represent a majority even of their dominant tribes, much less Namibia as a whole.

The majority party is the Democratic Turnhalle Association, a multiracial democratic movement that recognizes the ethnic

reality of the 11 ethnic groups in Namibia. In the elections held last December, DTA won not only a majority of the votes cast, but an absolute majority of both registered and prospective voters.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina has been in direct contact recently with all of the democratic parties—that is with a little "d"—in Namibia, and I can attest to the fact that there is a healthy political spectrum operating there. I do not support the political views and aims of all these parties, but I do support their right to exist and to go before the electorate in free and fair elections.

However, the United Nations does not support their right to exist. The United Nations recognizes only the terrorist organization, SWAPO, as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. Moreover, it provides extensive political patronage to SWAPO, not only through the Namibia Institute, but through millions of dollars in assessed and voluntary contributions.

So here the U.N. is setting itself up to be the impartial judge of elections in Namibia, but the U.N. itself is heavily financing one party, SWAPO—the one party that is determined to seize power through the barrel of the gun, rather than through the ballot box.

So the bottom line of this amendment, Mr. President, should be very clear: This hypocrisy has got to stop. We cannot pretend that financing so-called "educational and academic" programs such as the Institute of Namibia has nothing to do with the war against freedom being carried on by SWAPO. Of course, it has everything to do with it. The people of this country, the citizens and taxpayers of the United States, must not be required to fund this terrorist Institute. But unless this pending amendment is adopted, that is precisely what is going to happen.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from *American Relations* entitled "How the United Nations Finances Terrorists" be printed in the *Record* at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

"EXHIBIT 1
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JESSE HELMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HELMS: Thank you for your letter of March 23, regarding SWAPO's relationship to the United Nations. We have requested information from our Mission to the UN and several foreign posts to respond to some of your questions, but I wanted to provide you now with the information available in the Department.

I would like to begin by noting that from 1946 on the Namibian problem has been uniquely internationalized because, alone among countries handling a League of Nations mandated territory, South Africa refused to transfer the Mandate to the UN. This set South Africa on a collision course with the UN which has affected international treatment of the issue ever since.

Regarding the treatment of political parties inside Namibia, the Security Council and the General Assembly have followed different courses. The Security Council has recognized no Namibian party as superior to any other. Through its approval of the Western settlement Proposal and its authorization of the formation of UNTAG by the Secretary General, the Council has clearly taken a stand in favor of the solution advocated by the Contact Group and originally agreed to by all parties to the settlement, including

South Africa. The operations of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia will take place under the overall authority of the Security Council. The whole purpose of the proposed transition is to prepare for and conduct elections under United Nations supervision and control in which all Namibian political parties can take part on an equal basis. In this context, it is clear that SWAPO will have a position no more nor no less favorable than any other political party. Moreover, the record of the United Nations for impartiality in peacekeeping situations, such as in the Middle East and Cyprus, is very good indeed. There is every reason to believe that UNTAG will acquire itself in a similarly unbiased fashion.

"Regarding the decision of the UN General Assembly to endorse SWAPO as the 'sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people', many African states felt that early international recognition of one of the parties in Angola might have helped to prevent the civil war in that country. It was against this history that they decided to accord some recognition to SWAPO. Other members, agreeing that South Africa's continuing control of Namibia was illegal, accepted the African position. The Assembly arrived at this decision in 1973, well before the April 1977 beginning of the Western Five Power initiative on Namibia.

"Although the U.S. has not accepted that SWAPO is the 'sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people,' the U.S. does regard the South African occupation in Namibia as illegal and has since 1966 when the UN General Assembly, in Resolution 2145 of October 28, revoked the mandate which had been granted to South Africa by the League of Nations on grounds that South Africa was taking no action to bring the territory toward independence, that it had extended apartheid to Namibia, and that it had refused to recognize that the authority of the League of Nations for mandated territories had passed to the United Nations. The United States supported and voted in favor of that resolution in 1966. We also supported Security Council Resolution 284 of March 20, 1969, which recognized the UNGA action as well as the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice which, in 1971, upheld the GA resolution by ruling that the South African occupation of Namibia was in fact illegal.

"The following information is in response to the specific questions contained in your letter.

"1. TRAVEL COSTS FOR SWAPO MEMBERS

"We have had difficulties in identifying the exact travel cost for each individual but it appears that your figures for the travel expenses involved in paragraphs A-C of your letter were reached by taking the estimated total travel expense for all delegates, and dividing that figure by the number of delegates to attend. If that is the case, then I suggest that the figures involved may not be precisely accurate inasmuch as the travel expenses for any given representative may have been somewhat greater or smaller than those of another depending upon the distance traveled. Moreover, in at least some of these instances the proposed number of delegates did not attend the conferences in question, not all of the travel money was used, and some of it was returned to the original funding source.

"Under UN regulations, the organization pays the travel costs to key meetings of a limited number of delegates from each country, including the U.S. Although the exact amounts may not be correct, nevertheless the premise of the questions A, B, and C is accurate, i.e., that the United Nations does pay the travel expenses incurred by representatives of SWAPO to attend various international conferences taking place generally

within the UN system. Because UN members consider South African occupation of Namibia, illegal, it is argued that it cannot represent the interests of Namibia at international meetings; consequently, provisions for SWAPO to attend have been made. The United States voted against the UNGA resolution calling for UN funding for this purpose. However, the resolution was adopted. I should note that these and other expenses which you mentioned were provided by Dr. Martti Ahtisaari, in his capacity as Commissioner for Namibia, and were taken from UN 1977 assessed budget funds.

"2. UN COMMISSIONER FOR NAMIBIA

"The activities of the UN Commissioner for Namibia are funded through the regular assessed budget of the United Nations. The Commissioner has offices located in New York, Lusaka, Zambia and Gaborone, Botswana. The distribution of the staff and resources in 1979 according to information provided by the UN is as follows:

	Established posts	Temporary posts	Resources (thousands)
New York-----	1 ASG 1 D-1 2 P-5 4 P-2/1 1 G-5 4 G-4	1 P-5 1 P-4 1 P-3 1 G-5 2 G-4	\$514.0
Lusaka-----	1 D-1 1 P-2 6 LL	2 P-3 3 G-5	345.2
Gaborone-----	1 P-4 1 P-3 1 G-4 2 LL		113.8

"The employees in the Commissioner's office are international civil servants, and no record is kept whether they are members or supporters of SWAPO since the UN does not request information on political affiliations.

"3. THE UN COUNCIL FOR NAMIBIA

"The Council for Namibia is funded through the regular assessed budget of the United Nations. The Council for Namibia was created in 1967 by the General Assembly, once the South African mandate was revoked, to be the legal administrator of the territory until it attained independence. The U.S., and the Security Council, have never recognized this role for the Council.

"Resolution 33/182 authorized the expansion of the Council from 25 to 31 members. The present membership is composed of the following:

"Algeria, Angola, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Chile, China, Colombia, Cyprus, Egypt, Finland, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Turkey, USSR, United Republic of Cameroon, Yugoslavia, Venezuela, and Zambia.

"The Council meets in New York as required. During 1977 it was allocated 156 meetings on the basis of three meetings per week; however, actually only 86 meetings were held (including its standing committees and informal meetings). During 1978 the Council held a total of 97 meetings, 21 of which were Plenary Sessions and the balance were standing committees and informal meetings. The representative of SWAPO participates in the work of the Council as an observer.

"4. THE UN FUND FOR NAMIBIA

"The General Assembly established the UN for Namibia in 1971 to provide general development assistance to Namibia. In 1973 the Council for Namibia was named trustee of the Fund. The principal source of funding for the UN Fund for Namibia is voluntary contributions made by UN member states and from UNDP, although during 1979 some \$500,000 of the Fund's budget will come from

the regular UN assessed budget, in accordance with UNGA Resolution 32/9. The actual amounts contributed by member states vary from year to year. An enclosed table provides a breakdown of contributions made by member states in 1978, as well as amounts pledged in 1979. The United States does not contribute to the Fund.

"5. THE INSTITUTE FOR NAMIBIA

"A. Funding

"The principal source of funding for the Institute for Namibia is voluntary contributions from UN member states. However, as the Institute received \$100,000 from the Fund for Namibia in 1977, a case could be made that some of the money given by the Fund to the Institute could be derived from the \$500,000 provided to the UN Fund for Namibia from the assessed budget. Contributions from member states vary from year to year. Member states' contributions during 1973 amounted to \$1,740,500; unpaid pledges, as of 31 December 1978, \$57,900. In addition, in 1978 \$15,000 was contributed by the UNHCR, \$15,000 by UNESCO, and \$42,000 was provided from public donations. An enclosed table provides a breakdown of contributions made in 1976 and 1977 as well as amounts pledged in 1979, in accordance with UNGA Resolution 33/182C.

"The second primary source of funding for the Institute is the United Nations Development Program, which has reserved \$3.75 million from the Second Cycle (1977-1981) Indicative Planning Figure for Namibia for support of the Institute. Annual UNDP contributions accordingly average in the neighborhood of \$800,000.

"B. Origins and political preferences of institute students

"All of the Institute's students are Namibians. The bulk of them appear to be members or supporters of SWAPO. However, some of the students are also supporters of another Namibian liberation movement, SWANU, and some profess no political preference whatever. Professional staff members are listed on an enclosed table and are citizens of a variety of countries.

"Acting on behalf of the President, and after a careful review by our Embassy in Lusaka, Secretary Vance determined on February 6, 1979, that no fiscal year 1979 funds for the UN Institute for Namibia will be used to support the military or para-military activities of SWAPO. Although it is clear that there are some members of the faculty at the Institute who favor SWAPO and have expressed their preferences, these expressions, as well as those by groups who favor other political parties, have occurred within a climate of academic freedom that permits to keep silent. There have been incidents between supporters of SWAPO and SWANU at the Institute. As a result of one incident a group of SWANU supporters left the Institute. However, our Embassy in Lusaka, which maintains frequent contacts with the Institute, believes that these incidents have not affected the integrity of the Institute's academic program. It also seems clear that the degree of partisan support for SWAPO within the student body is subordinate to the basic Institute climate of academic freedom. The support of the United States, and the United Nations for the Institute is predicated on the maintenance of this academic freedom.

"6. ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR THE COMMISSIONER FOR NAMIBIA, THE COUNCIL FOR NAMIBIA, THE FUND FOR NAMIBIA, THE INSTITUTE FOR NAMIBIA, AND UN SYSTEM PROJECTS WHICH MIGHT BENEFIT SWAPO MEMBERS

"The UN is unable to provide information concerning the source from which Agency contributions to the Institute are made because this information is not requested when a contribution is received. However, except

as noted above. I am unaware of any funding provided to the Commissioner for Namibia, the Council for Namibia, the Fund for Namibia or the Institute for Namibia by any of the UN specialized agencies which you mentioned, UNDP or ECOSOC. However, UNDP and UN specialized agencies are involved in a number of humanitarian projects which benefit refugees throughout southern Africa. Frequently the refugees reside in camps, the administration of which is shared by a national liberation movement and the officials of the countries in which the camps are located. Moreover some of the refugees who reside in the camps and who benefit from the projects may be members or supporters of a particular liberation movement. A partial response to your questions in this area includes the following:

"UNESCO.—Two educational projects supported by UNDP which could benefit SWAPO members and which, taken together, total \$355,500. One of these provides teachers' salaries and equipment at the Namibia Health and Education Center in Zambia; the other provides similar assistance at SWAPO's school for Namibian children in Angola.

"FAO.—To my knowledge FAO does not provide funds for projects. However, it does provide food assistance to some Namibian refugees, some of whom may be members or supporters of SWAPO.

"UNICEF.—Provides no funding to the listed organizations but it does provide assistance to refugees from Namibia, some of

whom may be SWAPO members or supporters.

"ITU.—One UNDP funded project which sends 35 fellows selected by SWAPO to the Postal and Telecommunications Training College at Ndola, Zambia at a cost of \$344,400 for a three-year period.

"IAEA and WMO.—Neither of these specialized agencies provide funds to any of the four named Namibian organizations and I am unaware of any contributions which they might have made to projects which could benefit SWAPO.

"ILO.—The US is no longer a member of ILO, and the Department has no information regarding its expenditures. However, ILO Geneva has informed us that ILO regular budget funds have been used for manpower planning in cooperation with the Institute for Namibia. In addition, the ILO will be an executing agency for the Nationhood Program for Namibia and will engage in programs financed by the UNDP and the UN Fund for Namibia. In these activities, the ILO will be working with the UN Commissioner for Namibia and the Institute for Namibia. However, the ILO has not worked with or funded the activities of the UN Council for Namibia.

"WHO.—Namibia, represented by the Council for Namibia, is an associate member of the World Health Organization. The 28th UN General Assembly, in Resolution 3111, requested UN specialized agencies to take steps to enable the UN Council for Namibia to par-

ticipate fully in the work of these agencies. In pursuit of that resolution, the World Health Assembly, in May 1974, admitted Namibia as an associate member and invited the UN Council for Namibia to designate a representative to participate in the work of the WHO. WHO has an office located in Lesotho which devotes its attention to Namibia. In 1978 the WHO program in Lesotho consisted of support for the representative in Lesotho, consultants in health services, and fellowships for health manpower development. WHO funds earmarked for Namibia in 1978 totaled \$25,500, and \$24,300 has been allocated for 1979.

"7. REDUCTIONS

"Regarding your inquiry about the allocation of reductions in the amount of \$619.2 of the Secretary General's estimates \$2,604.9 for Namibia under Section 3 of the budget (A/33/445/Add. 4), the attached Table sets forth in detail for each item the amounts allotted by the UN for 1979 and reflect savings available from the 1978 appropriation and the reduction made by the Fifth Committee. The resultant amount appropriated for 1979 is also shown.

"As I noted above, I will provide a final followup response to your request as soon as the remainder of the information which you need becomes available.

"Sincerely,

"CHARLES WILLIAM MAYNES,
"Assistant Secretary for
International Organization Affairs."

U.N. FUND FOR NAMIBIA, 1978 CONTRIBUTIONS AND PLEDGES

Government	1978 contributions	U.S. dollars	Government	1978 contributions	U.S. dollars
Algeria.....	15,000		Senegal.....	1,000	
Argentina.....	4,000		Turkey.....	1,250	1,000
Australia.....	28,450	28,600	United Arab Emirates.....	4,000	
Austria.....	15,000	17,000	Republic of Korea.....	5,000	10,000
Belgium.....	30,921		Venezuela.....	1,000	
Finland.....		37,651	Pakistan.....	3,000	
France.....		160,000	Bahamas.....	500	
Ghana.....	1,740	1,740	Brazil.....	5,000	
Greece.....	3,000		Cyprus.....	258	
India.....	2,000	2,000	Egypt.....	2,000	
Indonesia.....	3,500	3,500	Ethiopia.....	3,000	
Iran.....	4,000		Iceland.....	2,000	
Ireland.....	5,329	17,893	Iraq.....	10,000	
Japan.....	10,000	10,000	Libya.....	15,000	
Kuwait.....	1,000	1,000	Mauritania.....	388	
Liberia.....	3,000		Mexico.....	5,000	
Netherlands.....	69,955	75,758	Nigeria.....	10,000	
New Zealand.....	5,127	2,000	Togo.....	227	
Philippines.....	2,000		Yugoslavia.....	5,000	

1 Pledges.

ANNEX II

STAFF LISTING/MANNING TABLE, AS AT DEC. 31, 1977

Post (grade)	Name	National	Remarks
Office of the Director:			
Director (D-2).....	Geingob, Hage G.	Namibia	
Personal assistant (P-1).....	Tabor, Constance	Jamaica	
Secretary (G-5).....			Vacant.
Secretary/typist (L-4).....	Bright, Maureen	Zambia	
Secretary/typist (L-3).....	S'hidhika, Phanny	Namibia	
Publications editor (P-4).....			Do.
Constitutional, legal and judicial affairs:			
Deputy director (D-1).....	Bonrani, Mark D.	Tanzania	
Secretary (L-5).....	Kaluba, Joyce	Zambia	
Senior lecturer (P-3).....	Ushewokunze, C. M.	Zimbabwe	
Lecturer (P-2).....	Tjirange, E. N.	Namibia	
Assistant lecturer (P-1).....	Sichitongo, M. D. F.	Zambia	
Secretary/typist (L-3).....	Sanmuganathan, Lilani	Sri Lanka	
Historical, political and cultural:			
Assistant director (P-4).....	Hamutenya, Hidipo	Namibia	
Secretary (L-5).....	Onyango, Aileen	Uganda	
Senior lecturer (P-3).....	Ncube, Mtshana	Zimbabwe	
Lecturer (P-2).....	Al-Nagar, Omar	Sudan	
Assistant lecturer (P-1).....	Parker, Kwadwo	Ghana	
Secretary/typist (L-3).....			Do.
Do.....	Musonda, Grace	Zambia	Staff member in finance at L-4.

ANNEX II

STAFF LISTING/MANNING TABLE, AS AT DEC. 31, 1977—Continued

Post (grade)	Name	National	Remarks
Economics:			
Assistant director (P-4)	Setai, Bethuel	Lesotho	
Secretary (L-5)	Mulally, Dorothy	United Kingdom	
Senior lecturer (P-3)	Kabi, Faith	Lesotho	
Lecturer (P-2)	Kauinge, M. J.	Namibia	
Assistant lecturer (P-1)	Matengu, Lemmy	do.	
Secretary/typist (L-3)	Luweva, Eunice	Zambia	
Agricultural and land resources:			
Assistant director (P-4)	Semiti, G.A.J.	Tanzania	
Secretary (L-5)			Vacant.
Senior lecturer (P-3)	Mihai, Domitru	Romania	
Lecturer (P-2)	Mshonga, Shakespeare	Zimbabwe	
Assistant lecturer (P-1)	Iyamba, Simon	Namibia	
Secretary/typist (L-3)	Nangula, Sophia	do.	
Social and educational:			
Assistant director (P-4)	Modise, Billy	South Africa	
Secretary (L-5)	Kategaya, Joan	Uganda	
Senior lecturer (P-3)	Tjitendero, Mose P.	Namibia	
Lecturer (P-2)	Muundjua, Pestus	do.	
Assistant lecturer (P-1)	Matsepe-Casaburi, I.	United Kingdom	
Lecturer (English) (P-2)	John, E. J.	India	
Assistant lecturer (English) (P-1)	Diallo, Aminata	United States	
Secretary/typist (L-3)	Shikangala, Maria	Namibia	
Do.	Isa, Beatrice	Tanzania	
Medical officer (P-3)			Do.
Nurse (L-5)	Muundjua, Pumootu	Namibia	
Office of the Registrar:			
Registrar (P-3)	Shana, Stan C.	Zambia	
Secretary/typist (L-3)	Agoruah, Marian	Nigeria	
Senior archivist/librarian (P-2)	Jario, Koukoro	Namibia	
Assistant archivist/librarian (P-1)			Do.
Trainee archivist (L-5)	Katanga, Sylva	Namibia	
Do.	Muundjua, Ripanga	do.	Do.
Do.			Do.
Do.			Do.
Secretary/typist (L-3)	Mumba, Rosemary	Zambia	
Office of Administration:			
Chief administrative officer (P-5)	Lombe, Petson D.	do.	Do.
Secretary (G-4)			U.N. at P-1.
Finance officer (P-3)	Desta, Engda	Ethiopia	
Secretary (L-4)	Nyaywa, Chiastar	Zambia	
Assistant finance officer (P-1)	Casals, Edgar	Philippines	U.N.
Finance clerk (L-3)	Kumwenla, George	Zambia	

ATTACHMENT C
SECTION 3—NAMIBIA

	Amount requested by SYG	Savings available from 1978 appropriation	Reduction	Appropriation		Amount requested by SYG	Savings available from 1978 appropriation	Reduction	Appropriation
Secretariat of the Council	116.2		47.0	69.2	Decree No. 1	105.8		30.8	75.0
Plenary meetings	188.0	43.5	31.0	113.5	Membership contribution	43.1			43.1
Missions	244.8	56.6	40.2	148.0	Special allocation	300.0			300.0
International conferences	261.8	60.7	43.0	158.1	Nationhood program	519.7		103.7	416.0
SWAPO	182.5	106.0		76.5	Fund for Namibia	500.0			500.0
Contacts	129.9	30.1	21.2	78.6					
Institute for Namibia	13.1	3.1	2.2	7.8	Total	2,604.9	300.0	319.1	1,985.8

UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR NAMIBIA, CONTRIBUTIONS BY ALL DONORS

	1976 contributions	1978 contributions	1979 pledges		1976 contributions	1978 contributions	1979 pledges
Brazil		10,000		Mali			
Canada	20,000	39,398	126,050	Netherlands	37,983	139,409	151,515
Cyprus		258		Nigeria		5,000	
Denmark		160,328		Norway	53,957	144,480	176,523
Egypt		2,000		Philippines		500	500
Finland		114,906	125,502	Republic of Korea		5,000	
France		20,000		Sweden		437,637	527,823
Germany, Federal Republic of		50,000	50,000	Togo		227	
Ghana	2,000	1,000	1,740	Tunisia			
Greece	2,000	4,000		Turkey			1,000
India		2,000	2,000	United Arab Emirates		4,000	
Ireland		5,640		United States of America	250,000	500,000	500,000
Italy				Venezuela		1,000	
Japan	50,000	50,000	100,000	Chile			1,000
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		5,000					

EXHIBIT 2
HOW THE UNITED NATIONS FINANCES
TERRORISTS

The Charter of the United Nations states that the first priority of the international organization is "to maintain international peace and security." Yet, in the name of peace, the United Nations in recent years has become a major source of support and legitimacy to ten revolutionary organizations which have depended upon terror as

a primary weapon of influence and power.

A case in point is the assistance given to SWAPO, the "South West African Peoples Organization." SWAPO is the organization which has figured prominently in the highly touted Namibia settlement, popularly attributed to the leadership of U.S. Ambassador to the UN, Andrew Young, and his chief assistant, Ambassador Donald F. McHenry. At the end of July, SWAPO finally accepted proposals offered by South Africa and a five-nation UN Security Council com-

mittee for a settlement based upon elections watched by UN observers.

SWAPO's ability to hold out against the settlement was based on the twin foundations of diplomatic and financial assistance from the UN and military aid and terrorist training from the Soviet Union. Its trump card was its willingness to use murder and arson against the black peoples of South West Africa to blackmail the West. Terror was the weapon that finally pried from the United States the concession to support

turning over the highly strategic deep water port of Walvis Bay to the future Namibia—in other words, to SWAPO and its Soviet ally.

Now that elections are in prospect, the question of aid to SWAPO ought to be reexamined. SWAPO never had a mandate from the black peoples of South West Africa, much less from the total population. SWAPO leaders constantly emphasize that they believe in control, not in majority rule based on democratic principles. Nor is there any evidence that SWAPO's vision of a Marxist-Leninist society is what the people of South West Africa want. In fact, the evidence is just the opposite, for SWAPO itself has become badly split. UN aid to SWAPO places the United States in the position of throwing its support to one side in a dispute—not only giving the leadership cabal of SWAPO an unfair advantage over the SWAPO dissidents, but over the democratically oriented political parties as well.

SWAPO's political base is rooted only in the Ovambo peoples—about 46 percent of the residents of South West Africa. And even SWAPO's control over the Ovambo is not based on shared ideals or free consent; it is based upon systematic terror raids upon the innocent. The prospect of free elections gives the Ovambo an opportunity to escape from SWAPO's power. Perhaps that is why SWAPO has chosen to step up the terror in recent weeks, bringing into doubt its good faith in accepting the proposed settlement.

SWAPO'S SOVIET AND CUBAN SUPPORT

Under the leadership of Sam Nujoma, SWAPO has moved closer and closer to the Soviet bloc, almost in direct proportion to the strength of his support from the UN. Nujoma visited Moscow in August 1976, where he received promises of more sophisticated weapons for SWAPO. In October of that year, he went to Cuba as the guest of the Cuban Communist Party's Central Committee, where he had talks with Fidel Castro and Ernesto Vilega, head of Cuba's trade union movement, who gave him promises of Cuba's "unshakeable support."

The Soviet commitment was renewed during Nujoma's meeting with the Soviet ex-president Podgorny in Lusaka on March 29, 1977. In July 1977, large Soviet transports, similar to Boeing 707's unloaded large quantities of military equipment in Luanda, including ground-to-air missiles and ground-to-ground missiles. Some of the ground-to-air-missiles found their way to the SWAPO base in Cassinga in the south of Angola.

To what extent such supplies have been transferred to SWAPO is not known; but in a speech the year previously to the UN Security Council, South African Ambassador R. F. "Pik" Botha (now Foreign Minister) reported that the Soviet weapons delivered to Angola included:

... multiple-barrel 122-MM rocket launchers; 122-MM rocket launchers; 122-MM field guns; 100-MM mortars; 82 MM recoilless guns; 75-MM recoilless guns; RPG-7 anti-tank rocket launchers; Sagger anti-tank missiles; T34 tanks; mobile bridging equipment; BTR-52 infantry fighting vehicles; MIG-21 aircraft; MIG-17 aircraft; Flat D-91 aircraft; Alouette III with air-to-ground missiles; Harvard T-6's; SAM-7 ground-to-air missiles 14.5 ZPU anti-aircraft, and so on.

These were the weapons, backed up by Cuban mercenaries, that Agostinho Neto used to seize Angola in the struggle against black guerrilla groups led by Holden Roberto and Jonas Savimbi. Such was the potential threat flashed by Nujoma in the face of the American negotiators.

In December 1977, Nujoma went to East Germany and met with the East German Communist Party chief Erich Honecker and Politburo member Hermann Axen, with whom Nujoma signed a written compact of cooperation for 1978 and 1979.

As early as 1965, various groups of SWAPO agents had been trained in guerrilla warfare in Moscow, China, Algeria, Korea, Egypt, Ghana and Tanzania. Using these skills principally against the Ovambo, they gained an ascendancy over that population group, but picked up very little support among other black African peoples in South West Africa. Instead, many of these joined in with the South African-sponsored Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, a multiracial group dedicated to democratic principles. Among the most prominent among the Turnhalle leaders was the distinguished moderate, Chief Clemens Kapuuo, leader of the Herero people.

ASSASSINATION OF KAPUOO

The main threat to SWAPO came from the democratic forces of the Turnhalle Alliance, just as the main threat to the Patriotic Front in Rhodesia came from Bishop Abel Muzorewa and the democratic black leaders. The campaign of terror against the common people was stepped up (see insert accompanying this issue), but a specific decision was made to assassinate moderate black leaders.

On February 7, 1978, two SWAPO agents burst into a political meeting at Okahao with submachine guns with the intent to murder Kapuuo. Kapuuo escaped, but another leader, Toivo Shiygaya, and his body guard were killed. Other fire aimed toward the unarmed crowd wounded a young boy. The SWAPO murderers escaped in the confusion.

Meanwhile, Nujoma, in a television interview, was saying:

"We are not fighting for a reform in the colonial system. We are fighting to liquidate the entire colonial system and to achieve genuine liberation."

"... The question of black majority rule is out—we are not fighting even for majority rule. We are fighting to seize power in Namibia for the benefit of the Namibian people. We are revolutionaries. You can talk to Kapuuo. Kerina and all those reactionaries about majority rule and not to SWAPO."

But there was to be little opportunity to talk to Kapuuo about anything, because Kapuuo lay dead in Windhoek from bullets fired by two SWAPO assassins on March 27.

THE CASSINGA STRIKE

On May 4, South African security forces, in a surgical strike, attacked a SWAPO base as Cassinga, in southern Angola. SWAPO apologists immediately assailed the attack as an assault on a "refugee" camp. On May 5, the UN General Assembly passed a resolution severely condemning South Africa for its attack, and expressing full and unqualified support for the continuation of the "armed liberation... of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO."

"Armed liberation" was a much more honest description of the Cassinga base than "refugee" camp. The only refugees in the camp were some 100 children who had been abducted by SWAPO at gunpoint from a mission school in South West Africa. The South African Security forces found formidable defense works, such as trenches, bunkers and underground shelters. Large quantities of Soviet and Eastern bloc weapons were found and destroyed, and men—and women—in uniform were captured in the trenches.

Also captured in Cassinga were motion pictures of training exercises of SWAPO troops in uniform on the parade grounds. Journalists who saw the films later identified various landmarks in the films that were evident in aerial photographs taken before the battle.

More to the point, captured documents indicated that SWAPO's code name for the base was MOSCOW. And further, documents showed that an agreement existed for the military and political training of 70 SWAPO members in the real Moscow—of whom 20 were already there.

THE IMPORTANCE OF WALVIS BAY

The strong Soviet and Marxist orientation of SWAPO makes more significant the maneuvering of the UN over the fate of Walvis Bay, the only developed deepwater port between Capetown and Luanda. The UN also condemned South Africa for "its decision to annex Walvis Bay"—an event that occurred over 100 years ago. Although South Africa has never claimed to have sovereignty over South West Africa (a territory originally held in mandate from the League of Nations), Walvis Bay has always been treated as sovereign territory. Whatever the future of South West Africa, South Africa cannot afford the strategic danger of a Soviet base in Walvis Bay. Nor could Western Europe remain easy at the prospect of a Soviet naval base bisecting the oil life-line from the Persian Gulf.

Walvis Bay was the trump card ostensibly played by Ambassador McHenry in winning Sam Nujoma's acceptance of the five-nation proposals for Namibia, proposals already accepted by South Africa. South Africa, however, had not agreed to include Walvis Bay in the settlement; the only agreement was to negotiate about the future of Walvis Bay with the new, democratically elected government of Namibia. However, the United States went around South Africa and agreed to a separate resolution on Walvis Bay that was not part of the settlement, but implied U.S. support for handing it over to SWAPO.

In July the UN accepted the settlement, and the UN Secretary General sent a delegation to South West Africa to prepare for voter registration and for elections. But at the same time, SWAPO stepped up its terrorism with more raids and killings (see insert), a move which casts doubt upon the sincerity of Nujoma's acceptance of the free electoral process.

Within SWAPO, Nujoma himself is under fire. His relations with Agostinho Neto, the head of the Cuban-backed Angola regime, have cooled since Neto was sobered by the South African strike on Cassinga. He has been strongly attacked by his rivals for his penchant for silk shirts and lavish hotel suites. More important is the imminent return of Andreas Chipanga, who is organizing what he calls SWAPO-D: SWAPO-Democratic.

Chipanga is bringing with him 11 former officers of SWAPO who had been locked up first in Zambia and then in Tanzania for criticizing Nujoma's high living and alleged Swiss bank accounts. When a writ of habeas corpus was brought in Zambia for their release from prison, Zambian authorities whisked them across the border to Tanzania where habeas corpus has been abolished by the "African socialism" of Julius Nyerere. Eventually even Nyerere was forced by African pressures to release Chipanga and his friends. They have been waiting in London for details of the electoral procedures to be established.

Aside from a commitment to democracy—and that is a highly significant difference—it is not clear how the principles of SWAPO-D differ from SWAPO. In addition, there is another political group, the Namibia National Front, that is to the left of the moderate Democratic Turnhalle Alliance. There is hope, therefore, that the citizens of the new Namibia will have a chance to make a democratic choice in the proposed elections. Yet the unyielding support of the United Nations for one and only one black political group out of a number of black political groups casts into doubt even the UN's commitment to democracy.

For the UN to single out one group as the "official" liberation group, which is to be the sole recipient of UN funding, assistance and political support is to take sides unjustly in an affair which ought to be the internal business of Namibians. But it is even more unthinkable that the UN would put the

money collected from member nations behind a group that advocates and practices terrorism—a group that continues to step up terrorism even after a democratic settlement has been agreed to by all parties.

The role of the United States in giving diplomatic support to SWAPO, in the face of SWAPO's overwhelming pro-Soviet, anti-Western, Marxist-oriented bias is almost to guarantee that a regime hostile to the United States and to the West will be given power. If SWAPO were the only alternative, a case might be made for working with SWAPO to gain influence. But the evidence is that there are many alternatives, some black, some multi-racial, most of them democratic. Neither the United States nor the United Nations should take sides in a manner to foreclose a truly democratic, multi-party, multi-racial society in Namibia. Yet the record shows that both the U.S. and the UN have been taking sides. They have used the agencies of the UN to funnel huge amounts of cash and services to assist in the development of a society that is more amenable to Soviet interests than to the interests of the West.

HOW UN ASSISTANCES FUNNELED TO SWAPO

The very complexity of the UN and its allied agencies makes it difficult to trace total funding to terrorist organizations such as SWAPO. The United Nations itself is financed both through assessed and through voluntary contributions from member nations. Some of the specialized agencies are similarly financed through assessed and voluntary contributions, while others are financed purely through voluntary contributions. To make matters more difficult to untangle, some voluntary organizations simply channel funds through the administrative staff of another UN agency with special expertise for the execution of the project—a staff that could be supported by assessed funds.

The significance of the distinction between assessed and voluntary contributions is that the United States is assessed, just like a tax, for a sum equivalent to 25 percent of the assessed budget. But despite the whopping chunk of the tab which the United States pays, its influence in deciding the priorities of UN spending is minimal, since the Third World has the votes to override any objections. Although other nations, such as the Soviet Union, refuse to pay or underpay some of their assessments, the United States has seldom done anything but hand over a blank check.

As for voluntary contributions, the U.S. generally chooses to pay about 25 percent of the budgets established for most of the specialized agencies, although in some cases the proportion is much lower. In a few cases, such as after the withdrawal of the U.S. delegation from the Communist-dominated International Labor Organization (ILO), the United States pays nothing.

The official policy of the United States is that all so-called development funds for humanitarian purposes should come from voluntary contributions (development funds are the main source of contributions to terrorist groups). Yet, more and more, the UN bureaucracy has been increasing the amount and scope of development funds included in the assessed contributions, over which the United States has very little control. When this money is diverted to terrorist groups, the U.S. is thus in the position of supporting terrorism willy nilly.

Nevertheless, the United States still contributes freely to development funds in the voluntary budget, even though the U.S. knows that the priorities include terrorism.

Even when the funds do not come from the United States directly, the projects are often planned and operated by administrative personnel who are paid from the assessed funds, into which the U.S. has paid 25 percent.

THE REGULAR UN BUDGET

The regular (assessed) UN budget is a major source of funding for SWAPO. Three special agencies are under direct control of the main UN body:

- (a) The UN Commissioner for Namibia
- (b) The UN Council for Namibia
- (c) The UN Fund for Namibia, which in turn funds The Namibia Institute

The UN Commissioner for Namibia is the UN's government-in-exile for Namibia. It has three offices in New York, in Lusaka, and in Botswana. The office in New York is the largest, with a budget of \$1,129,200. The office in Lusaka, which is located, coincidentally, in the same city as the office of the Soviet Ambassador to Zambia, V. G. Solodovnikov, former director of the Soviet Africa Institute, and widely regarded as the director of Soviet field operations in Africa. It has a budget of \$331,400. The office in Botswana has a budget of \$261,900. Thus the total budget for the UN Commissioner for Namibia for 1978-79 is \$1,722,500. These funds come directly from the assessed budget of the United Nations, of which the United States pays 25 percent.

The UN Council for Namibia has been considered by the UN as the administering authority for Namibia since 1967, although the Council's attempt to enter Namibia in 1968 was a failure. The Council has 25 member nations, and holds plenary sessions in Lusaka, the most recent being in March. The 1978-79 budget is \$1,581,700. The Council recognizes SWAPO as "the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people," and pays \$182,200 for SWAPO's office in New York City. All of these funds come directly from the assessed budget of the United Nations, of which the United States pays 25 percent.

The UN Fund for Namibia is a trust fund account established in 1971, which has received \$950,000 from the assessed UN budget, and \$1,303,874 from voluntary contributions. In 1974, the UN General Assembly approved the formation of the Institute for Namibia, which opened its doors in Lusaka in August, 1976. The most recent available information shows that the Fund for Namibia, had given \$846,549 to the Institute by March, 1977. However, the UN Development Fund, which will be discussed in detail below, has also given \$3,750,000 to the Institute from voluntary contributions. The Institute has a Senate of 11 members appointed for five-year terms.

The Commissioner, the Council, and the Institute are closely interrelated and consult with SWAPO at every step. In 1976, all the members of the Council, as well as the Commissioner, participated in the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held in Maputo, Mozambique, from May 16 to May 21. Prior to the Lusaka meeting this year, three consultation missions were sent by the Council, one going to Gabon, Algeria and Nigeria, one to Mozambique and Tanzania, and the third to Angola, Botswana and Zambia. Each mission was composed of five members of the Council and a representative of SWAPO.

Still further aid is provided by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, which in 1977 provided \$45,500 from voluntary contributions for aid to Namibian refugees. The High Commissioner for Refugees in addition, using funds provided by the Institute for Namibia, established a health clinic in Botswana for Namibian refugees, at a cost of \$40,000. There is no way to determine whether such assistance went to bona fide refugee civilians, or whether it went to the military camps of the SWAPO terrorists.

UNICEF AND THE UNDP

Much assistance is also provided through agencies associated with the UN Economic and Social Council and through the independent agencies.

UNICEF, for example, whose special mis-

sion is concerned with children, provided funding of \$455,900 to the World Health Organization (WHO) to establish a health institute for Namibian refugees in Tanzania. These funds came from voluntary contributions.

But by far the most ambitious program of assistance to SWAPO is arranged through the Economic and Social Council's United Nations Development Program (UNDP). The UNDP is supposed to be the UN's major arm for channeling development funds to underdeveloped nations. But the UNDP has interpreted that mandate to include assistance to the so-called liberation movements, including SWAPO.

Typically, UNDP projects consist not of cash transfers, but of the funding of special projects to provide specific assistance, thus putting supplies, facilities, and expertise at the disposal of the terrorist groups. The UNDP provided aid to projects benefiting SWAPO in 1976-77 amounting to at least \$7,297,042, all of it coming from voluntary contributions. Within the UNDP there is a special account, called the Colonial People's Trust Fund, whereby contributor nations can earmark contributions for specific projects.

Among the UNDP projects included in the above amount are some which the UNDP funded directly, and some which were funded using the specialized UN agencies as the executing entity. Among those funded directly was the \$3,750,000 grant previously listed for the Institute for Namibia. The UNDP also provided \$120,000 for an emergency airlift of foodstuffs to Namibian refugees in Angola, with the food itself provided by the World Food Program. No one knows how much went to "refugee" camps such as the military base in Cassinga. The UNDP also provided \$31,500 to SWAPO for "education and training in the field of public information."

By funding projects indirectly, the UNDP takes advantage of the special expertise of the specialized agencies. For example, through the World Health Organization, UNDP has provided:

- \$198,000 for the Namibian Health and Education Center in Zambia.
- \$23,382 for a second grant to the above.
- \$739,000 for the Tanzania Health Center.
- \$52,000 for the Namibian Health and Education Center in Angola.

An undetermined amount for SWAPO members included in general health assistance to all southern African liberation movements.

Through UNESCO, UNDP has provided \$151,500 in general educational assistance to SWAPO, and \$205,000 for educational assistance to SWAPO in Angola.

Through the International Labor Organization (ILO), the UNDP has provided \$1,570,838 for 200 SWAPO and Patriotic Front (Rhodesia) trainees in Botswana, Zambia and Tanzania for a two-year project. Some of the trainees will receive further training at the ILO Training Center in Turin, Italy.

Through the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), the UNDP has provided \$344,400 for training in radio, postal and telecommunications skills. Such skills, of course, have both a civilian and military application.

Through the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the UNDP has provided \$58,208 for the SWAPO farm in Zambia, \$29,382 for the SWAPO farm in Angola, and \$23,832 for "assistance in agriculture" to SWAPO. It is not clear whether these farms are for training in agricultural skills, or for providing food for the military bases in Angola and Zambia.

In addition to the UNDP funding, some of the above agencies provide benefits to SWAPO with funds from other sources. For example, the FAO has provided \$1,025,000 in foodstuffs for refugees in Angola from volun-

tary contributions of its own. In addition, the World Food Program, closely allied with FAO, has provided an undetermined amount of food assistance to the Institute for Namibia.

Furthermore UNESCO has budgeted \$4.426 million in 1979-80 for assistance to all the African liberation movements, including SWAPO. The proportion of assistance to SWAPO cannot be determined. This money will be used for the education of refugees and candidates sponsored by liberation organizations, for certain specialized training of qualified personnel, and for training in "respect for cultural identity." In addition to the \$4.426 million from UNESCO's own budget, UNDP is planning to give UNESCO an additional \$3.087 million—3 percent of its budget—for these purposes.

SUMMARY OF AID TO SWAPO

Because of the peculiarity of UN finances and the proliferation of quasi-independent UN agencies and mutual interfunding of the same projects, it is difficult to arrive at a specific total for aid to SWAPO. Although the data in this article is taken only from official UN and Congressional sources, it is far from complete, and comes from different time frames. For example, we have only been able to trace \$950,000 in assistance taken from assessed budgets between 1971 and 1977. But for the proposed biennium 1978-79, the UN plans to spend \$3,304,200 from assessed funds just for the Commissioner of Namibia and the Council for Namibia. It must be assumed that similar, although perhaps lesser, amounts were spent on these offices in the past.

As for funds from voluntary contributions, the amounts for projects mentioned in this article total \$8,686,416 in the past. But it should be noted that UNESCO alone, just one agency, plans to spend \$7,513,000 in the 1978-79 biennium. We have been unable to assemble total projections of spending for SWAPO for the biennium.

UN AID TO OTHER TERRORISTS

Although this analysis has concentrated upon aid to SWAPO, that group is not the only terrorist organization which has received funding, project assistance, diplomatic support and international legitimacy. At least nine other such groups have received regular support, although in some cases the groups finally seized power, and funding was shifted to normal development assistance.

Not surprisingly, the ten are all so-called "liberation" groups whose prime purpose is to overthrow Western-oriented administrations in certain territories and install "neutral" dictatorships of one kind or another—almost always overtly Marxist. The same groups almost always receive weapons, training and operational financing from Soviet, Chinese or Eastern bloc countries.

Given the power blocs that make up the United Nations, it is not surprising that the United Nations cloaks these essentially anti-Western operations with respectability. Nor is it surprising that the shibboleth of anti-racism is used as a convenient cover for what is actually a strategic move to deny strategic materials and geo-political locations to the support of the West. What is surprising is that money provided by the United States and Western European nations makes up the bulk of the financing provided by the UN to the terrorists.

THE APPROVED LIBERATION GROUPS

Only liberation groups which have received the stamp of approval from the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the UN seem to be eligible for UN funding. The ten groups have included:

The Palestine Liberation Front.

The Patriotic Front (ZANU and ZAPU in Rhodesia).

The African National Congress to Azania (ANC-South Africa).

The Pan African Congress to Azania (PAC-South Africa).

Movimento Popular de Libertacao de Angola (MPLA).

Movement for the Liberation of Djibouti (MDL).

Front for the Liberation of the Coast of Somalia (FLOCS).

Mouvement de Liberation National des Iles Comores (MOL).

Front National pour la Liberation de l'Angola.

And, of course, SWAPO.

What all of these groups have in common, besides a Marxist outlook in economics and political control, is a rabid anti-Western attitude. The UN refuses to support non-Marxist movements, such as Jonas Savimbi's UNITA in Angola, or Bishop Abel Muzorewa's UANC in Rhodesia. They are not considered to be "National Liberation Movements (NLMs)."

DEFINITION OF "TERRORIST"

Although the favored groups are officially considered NLMs by the UN, all of them more correctly ought to be termed terrorist groups. Some of their defenders seek to maintain that one man's freedom fighter is another man's terrorist but the word "terrorist" is used here advisedly to denote groups which, as a matter of tactics, conduct murder raids against defenseless civilians, plant explosives in non-military targets designed to injure civilians at random, and abduct or assassinate citizens of wealth or political importance.

The use of terrorism is never justified, not even when it is applied in the name of social justice. The kidnapping, torture, or murder of innocent civilians is never justified by an appeal to Marxist-Leninist concepts, making literal the theory of "class warfare." No amount of oppression can ever justify actions whose principal target is the people who are supposed to be "liberated." The Western ethic rejects the idea of collective guilt, and recoils from the political murder of innocents. The appearance of terrorism as a political strategy, therefore, almost always denotes an attack on Western values and interests.

In aiding terrorists movements, the UN consistently casts its aid in the guise of humanitarian assistance. The programs bear the label of health assistance, education or food for refugees. The UN never reveals whether the health facilities are used to treat terrorists wounded in the act of killing innocent civilians, or whether education includes technical training in military specialties, such as telecommunications, or whether the "refugees" are terrorists with knives or guns in their hands.

Yet, as was clearly established in the South African raid on Cassings, these putative refugee camps can be something far more sinister. Every such camp undoubtedly will include wives, children and hangers-on; but in no sense can they be considered as innocent citizens forced into exile by oppression. They have willingly chosen the way of the sword; and they have turned it against their own people instead of against the authorities they denounce as oppressors. It is a sign of the times that the West willingly chooses terror instead of justice, and eagerly finances its own destruction.

SUMMARY OF SWAPO TERRORIST INCIDENTS SINCE JANUARY 1978

JANUARY 5.—An Ovambo man was shot by a gang of terrorists. A number of AK 47 cartridge cases were discovered near the body.

January 8.—A private car with 10 civilian passengers detonated a Russian landmine. Four of the passengers were killed outright and six were seriously injured.

February 7.—The Ovambo Minister of Health, Mr. Shiygaya, was assassinated with a Russian-made pistol after a political meeting in Ovambo.

February 21.—A group of terrorists abducted 119 children and their teacher from the St. Mary's Mission School in Ovambo.

March 3.—Headman Mangola Kanyala was killed by a group of terrorists. His body was mutilated and his wife and children abducted.

March 25.—Another Headman, working for the South African Police, was shot by terrorists using a Russian-made pistol.

March 27.—Two terrorists assassinated the leader of the Herero people, Mr. Clemens Kapuuo. Mr. Kapuuo was widely regarded as a possible future leader of an independent Namibia.

April 18.—Two Ovambo children were killed by a Russian hand-grenade.

April 21.—An attempt was made on the life of the Ovambo's Minister of Justice, Mr. Tara Imbili.

April 22.—A bus was hijacked on the road between Oshakati and Ruacana. The bus with about 70 to 80 people on board was taken to Angola.

April 24.—South African forces made contact with 20 terrorists approximately 10 km south of the Angolan-South West African border. After a skirmish, the terrorists withdrew into Angola.

April 24.—A vehicle of South Africa forces was ambushed by SWAPO terrorists approximately six km south of the Angolan-South West African border. Security forces returned fire following which the terrorists withdrew to the safety of Angolan territory. A South African soldier was killed in this incident.

April 28.—A SADF patrol was attacked approximately 25 km east of Ruacana.

April 29.—Shots were fired at the border post at Ruacana. Fire was not returned.

April 29-30.—Landmines of Communist origin were set to explode at the new homes built for the members of the Ovambo Cabinet and the Legislative Assembly building at Ongwediva.

April 30.—A SADF patrol was attacked by approximately 10 SWAPO terrorists 45 km east of Enana. One SADF member was killed.

May 1.—Heavy fire was brought down on a SADF patrol approximately 43 km south east of Enana. A follow-up operation was mounted and the enemy fled over the Angolan border.

May 2.—The water pipeline running between Ondangua and Oshikango was sabotaged. (This pipeline is essential for the livelihood of the local inhabitants.)

May 3.—Heavy fire was directed at the guard post and buildings at Ruacana including structures of the water scheme. Several buildings were damaged. Fire was not returned.

May 20.—South African security forces encountered armed SWAPO elements from across the South West Africa-Angolan border on South West African territory.

May 22.—Further contact made with armed SWAPO elements in South West Africa.

May 23.—South African forces in the Ruacana area were fired on from Angolan territory. A member of the South African security forces was wounded.

May 26.—South African forces in the Ruacana area were again fired on from Angolan territory.

May 31-June 2.—Armed SWAPO elements again engaged in South West African territory.

June 4.—Two armed men were arrested at a point northwest of Outsp. Two Tokarev pistols, one R1 rifle and a hand-grenade which they had obtained from Angola were found in their possession.

June 21.—Two terrorists dragged Mrs. Paulus Shilango out of her house, killed her and fled back across the border into Angola.

This incident occurred two km south of Oshikango.

June 30.—Near Oshikango a South African transport aircraft flying from west to east over South West African territory was fired upon from Angolan territory.

July 4 and 7.—South African security forces were ambushed by armed elements from across the South West Africa-Angola border on South West African territory at the following positions:

(a) 17 degrees 52S 16-degrees 17E (approximately 10 km west of Okankolo)

(b) 17 degrees 53S 16 degrees 55E (approximately 60 km east of Okankolo)

July 7.—Security forces encountered armed elements from across the South West African-Angolan border on South West African territory at 17 degrees 35S 16 degrees. The encounter led to exchange of fire and a member of security forces was wounded.

July 7.—30 km northeast of Odangwa, on Omahenge area, a member of the local population, Nambamy Kange, was kidnapped by SWAPO terrorists.

July 13 and 15.—The following three incidents occurred as a result of landmines planted by SWAPO terrorists who infiltrated from Angola into the Omahenge area:

(a) Approximately 12 km northeast of Oshigambo a vehicle was badly damaged in a landmine explosion.

(b) Approximately 16 km south of Oshikango four members of local population died and eight were seriously injured in three explosions.

(c) Approximately 10 km south of Oshikango a further two landmines were detected.

July 20.—Approximately 120 SWAPO terrorists divided into four groups crossed the Angolan-South West African border into South West Africa between beacon 22 and beacon 31.

July 31.—Security forces made contact with SWAPO terrorists approximately 20 km east of Oshikango in Jati strip. Two terrorists were wounded and taken back across the border into Angola.

An unknown number of SWAPO terrorists were reconnoitering in South West Africa south of beacons 6-10.

July 16.—An Ovambo, Mrs. Helena Kanine, believed to be a DTA organizer, was murdered by SWAPO terrorists in the Ondangwa area.

July 25.—Approximately 20 km north of Ondangwa, a deputy chief, Mr. Japhet Shilumba, was murdered in his shop by eight SWAPO terrorists. Mr. Shilumba was shot in the back of the head with a Makarov pistol. The shop was afterwards plundered.

July 27.—Mr. P. Nipukulula, a teacher at Eembahu 20 km from the Angolan border, was murdered by a SWAPO terrorist who shot him twice through the head and then stabbed him through the throat and heart with a bayonet. Wife of the deceased was threatened and shop ransacked. Empty AK 47 cartridge cases were found on the scene of the murder.

July 29.—Approximately 12 km west of Eenhana a water pipeline was blown up.

July 30.—Eight telephone poles were blown up by SWAPO terrorists approximately 2 km south of Oshikango.

July 22 and 24.—South African security forces approximately 35 km west of Ruacana were fired on from Angolan territory. In the second incident; two members of security forces were wounded.

July 31 and August 2.—The following incidents occurred as a result of landmines planted by SWAPO terrorists who infiltrated from Angola into South West Africa.

(a) Four security force vehicles were damaged.

(b) Landmines were defused by security forces. One member of security forces slightly injured.

(c) A private vehicle detonated a TM 46 landmine approximately 30 km south east of Enans. Two members of local population killed and two seriously injured.

(d) A private vehicle detonated a TM 46 landmine approximately 7 km west of Enana. One member of local population was killed and a member of the homeguard injured.

(e) A TM 3 mine was discovered and lifted by security forces approximately 55 km south of Omhulu.

August 12.—Security forces were ambushed by SWAPO terrorists approximately 60 km east of Onkankolo. Three members of security forces were killed.

August 13.—Terrorists fired on South African police patrol approximately 20 km south west of Eenhans.

August 13.—Security forces were fired upon while drawing water approximately 5 km east of Oshikango.

August 12 and 13.—Following incidents occurred as a result of landmines planted by SWAPO terrorists who infiltrated from Angola into South West Africa:

(a) One TM 46 landmine was discovered and lifted approximately 2 km north of Singalamwe.

(b) One TM A3 landmine connected to TM 46 landmine discovered and lifted approximately 17 km west of Umbulu.

(c) A vehicle detonated a TM A3 landmine in the vicinity of Oshikango. A local resident, Mr. David Ohebo, was killed.

August 12.—A member of the local population, Mr. Elia Shikolola, was murdered by two SWAPO terrorists approximately 20 km south of Oshikango.

August 12.—A TM A3 landmine was discovered and lifted at approximately 18 km north west of Outapi. Tracks of 12 terrorists were found.

August 13.—A TM landmine connected to a TM A3 landmine was detonated by security forces vehicle approximately 15 km south east of Eenhana and one member of the security force slightly injured.

August 13.—A security forces bush hat was found booby trapped with a hand-grenade approximately 20 km west of Onkankolo.

August 14.—A TM 46 landmine was discovered and lifted approximately 17 km north east of Singalamwe.

August 15.—Security forces made contact with a group of SWAPO terrorists moving north toward the Angolan border 20 km east of Oshikango. After exchange of fire terrorists fled across border into Angola.

August 15.—One TM 46 landmine booby trapped with a hand-grenade was discovered and lifted approximately 16 km northeast of Singalamwe.

August 15.—A damaged TM 46 landmine was discovered approximately 15 km north-east of Onkankolo.

August 16.—A manhole on a water pipeline was blown up by SWAPO terrorists approximately 8 km south of Oshikango.

August 16.—Security forces encountered a group of terrorists approximately 5 km east of Oshikango. The group was preceded by two women armed with AK 47 rifles. Terrorists scattered after exchange of fire.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. INOUE addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNER). The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I find it necessary to speak in opposition to the amendment submitted by my friend from North Carolina. This Institute was created in 1976 by the United Nations General Assembly and it aims to train Namibian students for middle level positions in the civil service of an independent Namibia. The curriculum includes

3 years of basic secondary education. There is training in English, mathematics, political science, law and society, administration, history, economics, and education.

Research is conducted in areas of relevant concern. Examples are constitutional options for Namibia, agrarian and land reform, health and education surveys, and urban housing. The curriculum does not include military training.

Mr. President, the donors are primarily western countries. Since 1978, the U.S. contribution has been \$500,000 annually, which is approximately 18 percent of the total. Other donors include Canada, Western Germany, the Netherlands, and most of the Scandinavian countries.

The Reagan administration has asked for this money as a demonstration of the administration's support for an independent Namibia.

The U.S. contribution to the program is intended to demonstrate U.S. support for peaceful transition by preparing Namibians to administer their country at independence.

One of the weaknesses that history has shown whenever a colonial nation has left its colony has been the lack of preparation. This is replete throughout Africa. I believe the United States does not wish to have this repeated again in Namibia, a possible hot spot.

We have been assured that this is not a training school, a military school for SWAPO, nor is it a Marxist orientation center for Namibians.

It has been closely monitored. It is located in Zambia.

Mr. President, I think the sum is small, but I consider that this is in our national interest. If we should decide to move out of this activity, we may be inviting the very people we do not want involved to move in. There is a struggle going on at this time for the minds, the souls, and the hearts of Namibians. This is a small investment. I think it is an investment that will be appreciated by Namibians, and it is a small investment that will go a long way.

For the past 3 years, this amendment has been presented to the Senate. For the past 3 years the Senate has rejected it. I would hope that once again we reject this amendment.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I would agree with much of what the distinguished Senator from North Carolina says regarding the United Nations Institute. It has been a questionable institute.

My reservation at this time with this particular amendment is in the timing of it when there are some very delicate negotiations ongoing regarding the independence of Namibia. One of the very successful contact groups has just been in southern Africa meeting with some heads of state. There seem to have been some very positive efforts with regard to their Constitution and elections in Namibia.

I wonder if the Senator from North Carolina would consider language where-

by no funds would go to the Institute unless the President would feel it was so desirable.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator will yield, the Senator from Kansas and I have discussed this previously. She has suggested language which is perfectly acceptable to me because it serves the purpose that both of us want to serve.

The language which we have drafted jointly would add, at the end of the pending amendment, the words "except if the President determines and submits in writing to Congress that providing such funds will promote an internationally recognized settlement in Namibia".

If that language is acceptable to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, I will send it to the desk as a modification.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I think that says it very well and I would be very supportive of the amendment with that language added.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the able Senator.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kansas makes a fine contribution to the Foreign Relations Committee and to this Senate.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 647, AS MODIFIED

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send the modification to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as modified, will be stated. The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 13, before the period insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be available for the United Nations Institute for Namibia", except if the President determines and submits in writing to Congress that providing such funds will promote an internationally recognized settlement in Namibia.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from North Carolina on their cooperative effort. On behalf of the majority I am pleased to accept the amendment, as modified.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, with the perfecting amendment I will concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. President, I will not concur in the amendment, as modified.

The Senate a couple of years ago wrote a chapter in the history of Rhodesia when, in the process of trying to resolve the issues peacefully, the Senate, in its wisdom last year, or, rather, in April 1979 and the summer following, despite pleas to not involve itself in lifting sanctions against Rhodesia, ignoring pleas to let a peaceful process endure, saw fit to lift sanctions. None of our allies did the same thing.

That did not become law because, fortunately, the House of Representatives, the so-called other body, had more sense. They were not spooked. Because the House of Representatives saved the Senate from its wisdom, there was peace in Rhodesia, now Zimbabwe. Had the wisdom of the Senate prevailed, there would have been bloodshed, violence, civil war, and Soviet entree into Rhodesia.

Rather than the Senate realizing it made a mistake, rather than being thankful the blood is not on our hands, what do we do? We do it again.

We are now in the process of trying to resolve the issue of Namibia. Can you tell me how agreeing to this amendment, while they are negotiating the Namibian settlement, helps? It does not. Whose blood is it? It is not ours, obviously, but it is theirs.

The amount of knowledge in this body of the Third World is lamentable. You do not vote on a Third World end result because you do not want to go back and defend it.

This would be the same situation. We would vote in a reactionary way, hoping the House would save us, and, if it does not, well, "They are the ones who bleed. To heck with it."

It is very hard to understand why something like this would come up. The only people who are served by it are internal parties in Namibia who want to hang on and hang on, and the only other party which could possibly be pleased by this are the Soviets.

This amendment plays right into the hands of the Soviet Union propaganda in Africa. Why do you want to do it? We might as well write to the Kremlin and say, "Dear Sirs: Please forward whatever amendments you think would be helpful in pursuing your policy in Africa. We will pass them without reservation."

That is the de facto effect of what we are doing, Mr. President. You cannot find one European country that would endorse this. The amendment is introduced and we fall over.

Chester Crocker, who is the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, does not share my view of how to proceed in Southern Africa, but I think he is sincere, I think he is intelligent, I think he is openminded, and I have stepped back and not tried to interfere whatsoever with negotiations in Southern Africa. I have not uttered a word, but given him the leeway to try to resolve it. I think those on the other side of the issue have the same obligation. This amendment undermines that effort. So we get it up, we modify it with language, then we swallow it.

After a while, Mr. President, I shall get to the point, when something like this comes up and we know we will somehow get around it, that I shall let it go through without getting upset. But it represents the worst of what this body is about.

There are human beings whose lives are affected by what we do in this body. We did not give a damn in Rhodesia, did we? All those people would have died—well, that is their problem.

It is not their problem, Mr. President.

We wonder why we are having trouble dealing with Africa. Look no farther than this amendment.

Mr. President, I object to this amendment and even if I am the only one to vote against it, at least I shall not have to explain it later on to myself. I demand a rollcall on the amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. TSONGAS. Yes.

Mr. KASTEN. I want to be sure on what measure he is demanding a rollcall. There will be an amendment offered on elimination of funding for Zimbabwe. That is not the amendment before us at this moment. The amendment before us at this moment has to do with funding for the Institute of Namibia. I want to be sure the Senator is asking for a RECORD vote—I assume most of his text had to do with Zimbabwe. I wonder if he could not allow this amendment to be accepted by a voice vote, and then we may have a RECORD vote and some discussion on the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina dealing with the question of the total elimination of funding for Zimbabwe, which I understand may be before us momentarily.

Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. President, I was speaking to the amendment that would eliminate money for the Namibian Institute. That is not an institute that I would subscribe to. My objection is to our willingness willy-nilly to intervene, to have an impact that can only be negative in terms of the negotiations. I would prefer that these kinds of amendments be fought so that at least the word goes out that there is at least a nucleus of people in the Senate who recognize the implications of what we are doing and are willing to vote no. Even if it is only one or two people, some Africans reading this transcript will not think we all are somehow party to this kind of very irresponsible, very rhetorical, very dogmatic, inflammatory movement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair seeks clarification from the Senator from Massachusetts concerning his pending request for the yeas and nays. Is that request still pending?

Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. President, I demand the yeas and nays on the issue of the Namibian Institute if for no other reason than that one Member of this body is going to vote no.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. INOUE. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from North Carolina No. 647 as modified by the Senator from North Carolina in accordance with the suggestions made by the Senator from Kansas. As I understand it, the Senator from Massachusetts has requested the yeas and nays on that amendment as modified.

The question is, Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, may we have the clerk read the full amendment as modified?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First, we have to establish, under the rules, if there is a sufficient second to the request for the yeas and nays.

The Chair puts the question to the Members of the Senate, Is there a suf-

ficient second? There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. TSONGAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. President, I shall yield to the request of the Senator from Hawaii and the Senator from Kansas, but I want the record to indicate my strong opposition to any amendment which deals in this fashion and, hopefully, the administration will see it in its interest to take advantage of the modifying amendment. Hopefully, we shall go through this again perhaps next year, but I want it to be made very clear that I, for one, object to this kind of intervention and the human toll that it represents.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina as modified.

The amendment (UP No. 647), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HELMS. I move to reconsider the vote, Mr. President.

Mr. KASTEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 648

(Purpose: To prohibit the availability of funds for Zimbabwe while North Korean military personnel are in Zimbabwe)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send an unprinted amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 648.

On page 23, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

SEC. 522. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available after January 1, 1982, for the purpose of furnishing assistance for Zimbabwe while any military adviser or technician or other military personnel of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is in Zimbabwe.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this amendment is one which may disturb my friend from Massachusetts. He has already alluded to it. As he indicated in terms of his position on the amendment just approved, he wished to be on record in opposition to that amendment. By the same token, I offer this amendment to sound a warning not only to the Senate but also to the Reagan administration, with which I think I have fairly satisfactory credentials in terms of support.

The pending bill includes an appropriation of \$75 million for assistance to Zimbabwe. That \$75 million figure has a familiar ring. The Senator from Louisiana, whom I observe listening intently to this debate, may recall that that was

the precise amount that was appropriated for Nicaragua, and this Senator twice stood in this spot and implored Senators not to put that money in the hands of the Sandinistas. The Senator from North Carolina did not prevail on either occasion, and I anticipate that the Senator from North Carolina will not prevail on this occasion. However, I feel that I owe it to my conscience at least to make the point and sound the warning.

As to the \$75 million in this bill for assistance to Zimbabwe, we debated this issue at length when the matter came up on the authorization legislation. Briefly, today, the facts are the same as they were then. The Prime Minister of Zimbabwe, one Robert Mugabe, is a self-proclaimed Marxist who is trying to set up a one-party Marxist state in Zimbabwe, in defiance of the Lancaster House accords. Moreover, Mr. Mugabe is presently host to a large number of North Korean military personnel who are busily engaged in training a special unit for the repression of political dissent in Zimbabwe—Zimbabwe, of course, having been formerly known as Rhodesia.

Mr. President, I acknowledge that the precise number of North Koreans in Zimbabwe at this time has been a matter of debate. I believe that it is uncontested, however, that the first contingent numbered 106 and arrived some time in mid-summer. That is the number that the State Department is sticking to. However, other information, entirely credible to the Senator from North Carolina, which has appeared in distinguished European publications such as the Economist, in Britain, and Die Welt, in Germany, places the number of North Koreans in Zimbabwe at over 200.

Furthermore, I have received reports from individuals who have interviewed witnesses in Zimbabwe who have seen more North Koreans coming in by way of the railroad to Beira, Mozambique, and which place the number closer to 500. The exact number, I submit, is not important. What is important is the principle.

It is also highly significant that the training that the North Koreans are giving in Zimbabwe, in part, involves the use of weapons which North Korea had supplied to Mr. Mugabe before independence, while he was a terrorist—in fact, during his period of terrorist activity.

Mr. President, this is a matter of great concern to this Senator. Mr. Mugabe's turning to North Korea for assistance at this time is a matter of utmost gravity. The type of communism in North Korea is one of the most rigid and brutal in the world. It is a brand of communism that Mr. Mugabe has always admired, and it is not at all surprising to this Senator that Mr. Mugabe now turns to the North Koreans for training, as he moves inexorably toward a more repressive society. The North Koreans are known to be ruthless and effective fighters in the world.

I do not question the sincerity of Senators in this body who still hold out hope that Mr. Mugabe, by some magical turn of events, may turn into a moderate and

that he still wants to have a Western-style society in Zimbabwe. It is possible, though not at all probable, in the view of this Senator. I hope that my distinguished colleagues who hold that hope are correct, and I hope they will be proved correct. However, it seems to this Senator from North Carolina that what we are witnessing is a transition toward—not away from—a classic Marxist state. They propose to do it with \$75 million of the American taxpayers' money.

So my fear is—we have seen it elsewhere, Nicaragua being a good example—that what appears to be a period of moderation is merely a transition period toward that classic Marxist state.

As I said at the outset of my remarks, Mr. President, was had a similar debate along the same lines on the Senate floor about a year or two ago with respect to the prudence of giving aid to Nicaragua. Some of my distinguished colleagues, for whom I have the utmost respect and affection, at that time thought, as some think with respect to Zimbabwe today, that we were witnessing in Nicaragua a period of moderation and that it would be appropriate to help the private sector in Nicaragua. I tried to argue at that time that such assistance would simply give the Marxists in Nicaragua even more control over the private sector and that it would bring about a more rigid Marxist state.

Now where are we with respect to Nicaragua? At the present time, the administration wholeheartedly agrees that Nicaragua is now totally under Marxist control and is a surrogate in Central America for Cuba and the Soviet Union in stirring up revolution.

Mr. President, I submit that the situation in Zimbabwe is absolutely analogous to the situation in Nicaragua a year or so ago. What we are observing is a transition period. In my view, we should not be giving any aid to Zimbabwe at all.

Nevertheless, I am still willing to give Mr. Mugabe a chance to prove that he is in fact a moderate. Before he receives aid from the United States, he should give the American taxpayers and the U.S. Government a signal that he is not abandoning his ties to the West. That signal should come only in the form of the removal of the North Korean troops recently in Zimbabwe. Why should we be giving financial and moral assistance to a country that is using one of the most despicable regimes in the world to train troops for internal control of dissent? How can we justify that to the U.S. taxpayers?

I do not know about other Senators, but I could not go home and send that proposition to my people of North Carolina.

This amendment merely provides that no assistance can be given to Zimbabwe while any military advisers or technical or other military personnel of the so-called Democratic People's Republic of Korea is in Zimbabwe.

I hope Senators will consider how the vote on this amendment may look to the taxpayers in their respective States a year from now. How accountable are we to the decent, upstanding citizens of the United States who will have grave

doubts about the provision of assistance to a government headed by a Marxist, that is using North Korean Communist troops to train a praetorian guard to keep itself in power? If Mr. Mugabe is the friend of the West that he pretends to be, he will not hesitate to rid his country of North Korean military personnel. North Korea is a country that we have never signed a peace treaty with, that we do not even recognize in diplomatic relations. How can we collaborate with such a nation, even indirectly, at this time? Maintaining North Korean troops there is an unfriendly act, and we should withhold aid if they are not removed.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I shall be very brief because we previously voted on a similar amendment on October 22 and by a vote of 14 to 61 rejected the amendment of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. President, the preponderance of assistance to Zimbabwe—military and especially economic assistance—continues to come from the West. The Reagan administration has chosen to stand with our Western friends in supporting a country which holds great promise for us in economic and political terms.

Economically, the U.S. private sector has taken a special interest in Zimbabwe's future. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has established a special chapter there. There is a United States-Zimbabwe Trade Council.

Diplomatically, Zimbabwe has reacted positively to the efforts of the Reagan administration to work with South Africa and the other key parties to reach a Namibian settlement. The Reagan administration believes that a settlement is vitally important to our security interests in Africa.

A vast number of our Western friends have decided that Zimbabwe is a country worth supporting. In addition to the Reagan administration and Prime Minister Thatcher's government, the Governments of France, West Germany, Canada, Belgium, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries provide aid to Zimbabwe—just to name a few.

With regard to the presence of North Korean personnel in Zimbabwe, I would emphasize that our British friends continue to play the overwhelmingly predominant role in training and equipping the Zimbabwean Armed Forces.

To cut off all aid because Zimbabwe's leader has accepted an offer of a very small amount of training, cost-free, from a nation which supported him prior to independence, would be very shortsighted.

Mr. President, I believe that the administration's request for assistance to Zimbabwe makes good sense, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina that we do have to be accountable in our voting record, though we are also here to exercise some thoughtful judgment on some very perplexing and complex issues.

We have had this debate before on October 22 when a similar amendment was offered to the Foreign Assistance Authorization Act.

The situation has not really changed since then.

I have been trying to follow very closely what the troop situation is in Zimbabwe, and the State Department has said that there are no more troops coming in than that were there at that time and at that time their figures were about 100, or 106, as a matter of fact, to be exact.

Salisbury is a small town about the size of Topeka, Kans., and I think if there were an unusually large troop movement of North Korea troops coming into the Salisbury, there would be many who would be very aware of this.

Zimbabwe is a country of important political, economic, and strategic interests to the United States. The U.S. relationship with Zimbabwe is based on this administration's understanding of the importance of all of southern Africa to America's security and prosperity.

There is a consistent and well-thought-out policy that has been approved by the President and which applies to the whole region.

One of the principal goals of our southern African policy is to halt the spread of Soviet influence in the region and with this I heartily concur with the Senator from North Carolina.

Within the Zimbabwe government there exists a wide variety of opinions concerning the future of that country.

For us to withdraw our economic assistance to Zimbabwe would strengthen the hands of those within the Zimbabwe government who wish to move that country into a closer relationship with the Soviet Union and its allies.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on African Affairs, I believe we simply cannot adopt policies that will increase the influence of the Soviet Union in southern Africa.

Rather we should be seeking to counter the existing Soviet influence through a positive foreign policy.

Foreign assistance such as the proposed aid to Zimbabwe is an essential element in an energetic and positive foreign policy.

I certainly share with the Senator from North Carolina concern about the level of Soviet influence in Zimbabwe, but I differ with him on the best method of countering that influence.

Rather than withdrawing from the leading role we are playing in Zimbabwe I would increase our involvement in that country. I would do this because I believe that the principles for which we stand, fair play, individual liberties, and human dignity, are the most powerful principles that the world has ever known, and I am convinced that our principles will inevitably triumph, but they cannot triumph if we close the door and refuse the hand of friendship.

Prime Minister Mugabe will have an important role to play in our search for a settlement and an end to foreign military pressure in southern Africa. In order to gain his cooperation in achieving

our foreign policy goals, a careful diplomacy must be practiced.

The Reagan strategy in southern Africa is working. Slowly but surely the United States is achieving results in protecting American national interests in this increasingly important region of the world.

Foreign policy by legislation in the middle of sensitive political negotiations is dangerous and as it clearly undermines the President's credibility in dealing with foreign leaders.

Mr. President, on the last day of September the Senate voted to free the President's hands in another country in southern Africa. Our action had an impact on his ability to negotiate successfully with the parties in the region because it demonstrated to the world that he had the full confidence of the Senate in his regional strategy.

To now vote to undermine that strategy by removing a key element in it would be I believe a tragic mistake.

This policy has the full support of the Secretary of State and of the President.

For these reasons I hope this amendment will not be successful.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the eloquent remarks of our distinguished friend from Kansas.

I wish to add that if we carry this amendment to its logical conclusion by suggesting that none of the funds appropriated by this bill would be made available for the purpose of furnishing assistance to any country while military experts or advisers or technicians of a Communist country may be in its area we would have to cut out aid to Poland, we would have to cut out aid to Jordan. Incidentally, Jordan just purchased SAM-6's from the Soviet Union. We would have to cut out any sort of relationship with Tanzania, Zambia, Zaire, India, and several others.

If we took that attitude, we would just isolate ourselves and we would lay the red carpet out for the forces of the Socialist world.

I hope that we do not make that mistake. We have made that mistake too often.

I can recall as a young man when we, for some unknown reason, decided to support a man called Fulgencio Batista. I think he was about as bad as any dictator in this century. With this man Fidel Castro, again we had an opportunity to have someone on our side, but we decided since he was a Marxist he was no good, and we continue to be troubled by that decision.

I hope that we do not repeat that decision here.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I was tempted to say gee, I do not quite know how to respond in the proper way to such a charming, lovely, and intelligent Senator as is the able and distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Yet I do not want her to misinterpret what I am about to say as a statement made in a caustic manner because it is not.

But as I listen to her and as I listen to my dear friend from Hawaii (Mr.

INOUE). I felt that I was hearing a replay of the same thing that I heard when we debated on this floor the question of sending \$75 million to the Sandinistas in Nicaragua.

I think it is pretty generally agreed that aid to Nicaragua was an inappropriate move. But I heard on that day, "Oh, we must hope." Hope for what? Hope that a leopard will change its spots? Hope that a Marxist will all of a sudden stop being a Marxist and start being a moderate?

I have got to say in all honesty, Mr. President, that I did not anticipate that I would see the policy being pursued here as one that would come from the Reagan administration. But the more I enquired, the more I found out. The so-called "country plan" which outlined the proposal for aid to Zimbabwe was worked up by whom? It was worked up by the Carter administration. It was prepared, Mr. President, by the Carter diplomats on the ground in Zimbabwe in the rush of excitement after independence. They broke all records to get emergency aid to Zimbabwe last year, and they wanted a grander proposal.

It was completely completed on paper within a few days after President Reagan came into office. It was printed for distribution in February of 1981, and Ronald Reagan, by that time, did not even have the seat of his chair warm.

Maybe I misunderstand the situation, Mr. President, but I thought the people of this country voted for a change last November, not only economic change but a foreign policy change. I do not think they voted to have the U.S. Government continue to support the spread of socialism or Marxism or communism in Africa.

I do not think the American people expected that the Carter plan—and that is what we are talking about, the Carter plan—to give \$75 million to Zimbabwe would be adopted in toto.

What we have here, Mr. President—and I say this with all due respect for and affection for an administration which I have done my best to support—are the same bureaucratic ideas that were repudiated I think by the voters in November of 1980.

For that reason, if I am the only Senator to vote against sending this \$75 million to Zimbabwe, so be it.

I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. President, just as a point of information on the part of the White House, Jimmy Carter has not been there for 10 months. This is a proposal from the Reagan administration, and I support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. SASSER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN) is absent because of a death in the family.

I also announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANFORTH). Is there any other Senator in the Chamber who desires to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 67, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 381 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Armstrong	East	Long
Byrd	Ford	Mattingly
Harry F., Jr.	Garn	McClure
Byrd, Robert C.	Grassley	Nickles
Cannon	Hatch	Proxmire
Chiles	Hawkins	Randolph
DeConcini	Hayakawa	Symms
Denton	Helms	Thurmond
Domenici	Humphrey	Warner

NAYS—67

Abdnor	Glenn	Packwood
Andrews	Gorton	Pell
Baker	Hart	Percy
Baucus	Hatfield	Pressler
Bentsen	Heinz	Pryor
Biden	Hollings	Quayle
Boren	Huddleston	Riegle
Boschwitz	Inouye	Roth
Bradley	Jackson	Rudman
Bumpers	Jepson	Sarbanes
Burdick	Johnston	Schmitt
Chafee	Kassebaum	Simpson
Cochran	Kasten	Specter
Cohen	Laxalt	Stafford
Cranston	Levin	Stennis
D'Amato	Lugar	Stevens
Danforth	Mathias	Tower
Dixon	Matsunaga	Tsongas
Dodd	Melcher	Wallace
Dole	Metzenbaum	Williams
Durenberger	Mitchell	Zorinsky
Eagleton	Murkowski	
Exon	Nunn	

NOT VOTING—7

Goldwater	Leahy	Weicker
Hefflin	Moynihan	
Kennedy	Sasser	

So Mr. HELMS' amendment (UP No. 648) was rejected.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KASTEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I respectfully request a rollcall on passage of the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 649

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New York and myself, I send an unprinted amendment to the desk and ask that it be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), for himself and Mr. MOYNIHAN, proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 649.

On page 19, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 551A. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act shall be available to any country in which on November 21, 1979, the United States Embassy and other U.S. Government property was attacked, and in which attacked American citizens died, and which has not paid full compensation in United States dollars to the United States Government for all damage done to U.S. Government property, for all damage done to property of United States citizens, for all expenses incurred by the United States Government directly and indirectly as a result of the attack, and for the loss of life of American citizens and of employees of the United States Government. For purposes of this section, full compensation shall include, but not be limited to, the cost of rebuilding and repairing all U.S. Government buildings damaged or destroyed in the attack; the cost of replacing or restoring all furnishings damaged or destroyed; the cost of replacing or restoring the lost, damaged or destroyed personal property of United States citizens and of local employees of the United States Government; the cost of renting, or otherwise acquiring office and housing space to replace the offices and United States Government housing rendered unusable; the cost of evacuating dependents of U.S. Government employees and the additional costs occurring to the United States Government for the support of dependents outside of the country from which they were evacuated; the amount of additional expenditures by the United States Government required to protect properly United States Government property and personnel remaining in the country after November 21, 1979; expenses incurred by the United States Government in assembling and presenting claims for damages resulting from the November 21, 1979, attacks, including legal fees; and appropriate sums for the benefit of the families, heirs and assigns of the United States citizens and local employees who died in the November 21, 1979, attacks. Appropriate sums to compensate for loss of life shall be not less than the greater of (1) compensation received by the families, heirs, and assigns of those who lost their lives, or (2) \$500,000 for each life lost.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this is an amendment the Senator from New York had considered introducing. Unfortunately he could not be here so I am introducing the amendment with the Senator from New York as a cosponsor.

Mr. President, 2 years ago Americans watched in horror as mobs seized or sacked American Embassies in Iran, Pakistan, and Libya. Now, the administration is proposing to provide one of those countries, Pakistan, with \$3.2 billion of taxpayers money; and \$100 million is appropriated for Pakistan in this bill.

Mr. President, the amendment is simple. The operative paragraph says "None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act shall be available to any country in which on November 21, 1979, the United States Embassy and other U.S. Government property was attacked * * * and which has not paid full compensation in United States dollars to the United States Government for all damage done." In effect, the amendment says to Pakistan, "Pay for the damage done to our Embassy before the enactment of this bill or you will lose the \$100 million in assistance."

Mr. President, it was almost 2 years ago that a mob in Islamabad attacked and completely gutted our Embassy. For more than 5 hours the military government of President Zia ul-Haq did absolutely nothing in spite of increasingly desperate pleas for help from American diplomats trapped in the burning Embassy. In this attack, two Americans died and our entire diplomatic staff in Islamabad would have been incinerated.

On that same day the American center in Lahore was burned to the ground as was our center in Rawalpindi. There were also destructive attacks on our consulates in Lahore, Karachi, and Peshawar.

Mr. President, it defies belief that the military regime could not have properly protected the U.S. Embassy, if it had been so inclined. The failure of the Government of Pakistan to protect the U.S. Embassy was a gross failure to live up to its obligations under international law and, speaking bluntly, constitutes toleration of an act of terrorism.

Two years after the attack the Government of Pakistan has still not finished paying the bill for the attack. I recognize Pakistan has recently paid for some of the damages caused. However, the Government of Pakistan still owes some \$7 million for items such as furnishings, vehicles, and equipment. In addition, Pakistan has offered no compensation to the families of the deceased.

The amendment would require Pakistan to pay for these costs. In addition, Pakistan would have to compensate the U.S. Government for the cost of evacuating U.S. citizens, an evacuation made necessary by Pakistani refusal to properly protect American citizens in Pakistan, and for necessary security expenses. Finally, the amendment includes very modest compensation—\$500,000 per life—to the families of the deceased.

Mr. President, I do not believe the U.S. taxpayer should pay 1 cent for the outrage that occurred 2 years ago in Pakistan. I sincerely regret that the Pakistani Government has not seen fit to live up to its obligations. However, I cannot see pouring billions into a "new relationship" with a country that will not pay the few million in damages for which it is so clearly responsible.

The amendment does not prohibit assistance to Pakistan. In fact, it does not even name Pakistan. Simply by fulfilling its obligations under international law, Pakistan can escape the effects of this amendment.

Mr. President, by approving this amendment, we will send a message to Pakistan that our patience is at an end. By paying before the enactment of this bill, Pakistan can still get the \$100,000,000. Surely 2 years is long enough for a settling of accounts.

Mr. President, passage of this amendment will also send a clear message to the world that we expect our Embassies and diplomats to be treated with decency and respect. No country should think it can get away with the kind of terrorism that occurred 2 years ago in Islamabad. This is an amendment that I think will

be applauded by Foreign Service officers everywhere and by the American people. I urge the passage of the amendment.

Mr. President, I do not intend to ask for a rollcall vote if this matter can be accepted. If it cannot be accepted, I shall ask for a vote.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, it is with great reluctance that I speak against the amendment. The Department of State has advised the committee that, as of this moment, all claims made against the Government of Pakistan have been honored by the Government of Pakistan. As of this moment, of the claims submitted, \$18 million have been paid. There are \$4 million more not completely processed. However, the Government of Pakistan is in the process of entering into appropriate contracts so that these remaining \$4 million in claims can be resolved.

Mr. President, I have to say that this amendment is unnecessary. Moreover, I think at this time, when we are trying to send a friendly message to Pakistan, it may send a wrong one. I hope that the Senate will be against this amendment.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I, too, reluctantly oppose the amendment of the Senator from New York. It is my hope that the Senator from Rhode Island will not ask for a rollcall vote despite the fact that it cannot be accepted by either the majority or the minority on the committee.

Essentially, Mr. President, the amendment would, for all practical purposes, eliminate assistance to Pakistan. The Senator from Hawaii is correct: negotiations are now under way to resolve these problems. The Government did not burn down the Embassy. I do not know of any cases in which payment for the loss of foreign property such as this, in which the U.S. property has been paid for, has been backed by the United States.

Finally, Mr. President, at this time, with the changes that we are seeing in this region, we have to recognize the importance of Pakistan. I think it is absolutely crucial.

For those reasons, Mr. President, we have to oppose the amendment of the Senator. It is my strong hope that he will not insist on a record vote.

Mr. PELL. I suggest, Mr. President, that we are not asking for aid from other countries. Pakistan is asking for aid from us. The burning of the Embassy was 2 years ago this week. So far, accounts have not been settled. Furthermore, the issue of compensation for loss of life has not been considered. My hope is that this will spur Pakistan to move ahead and settle up their just debts.

Is there any possibility of an assurance by the chairman and the ranking member that every effort will be made to insure that the Pakistani Government will comply or fulfill their just debts to the United States in this regard?

Mr. KASTEN. On behalf of the subcommittee, Mr. President, and I believe I can also speak on behalf of the administration, I assure the Senator from Rhode Island that we shall do everything we can to assure that the negotiations which are now underway continue at the most rapid rate, and that we shall work

on these negotiations. I shall do everything I can to press the administration and the Pakistani Government to come to agreement on all legitimate questions.

Mr. PELL. Can the Senator provide assurances that we will seek fair compensation for the loss of life?

Mr. KASTEN. I cannot make any firm assurance on the question of compensation for loss of life, because I do not know of any precedent for compensation for loss of life. I can assure the Senator and the Senate that I shall bring this point forward strongly and say this was the subject of important debate on the floor of the Senate. A number of Senators are concerned about this issue, and I would like for these concerns to be taken into consideration.

Mr. PELL. Does the ranking minority member feel the same way?

Mr. INOUE. Yes, sir, Mr. President. Mr. PELL. Given these assurances, I am prepared to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1982

MOTIONS MODIFYING COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 4121

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, on September 22, the Committee on Appropriations reported H.R. 4121, an act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for fiscal year 1982. One week later, the President submitted a new package of budget cuts, including numerous reductions in the programs funded in the Treasury/Post Office appropriation bill.

The committee has carefully considered all of the President's newest proposals, and has adopted them wherever possible. At a meeting of the committee on October 22, the committee voted to reduce the already reported appropriations for the Departments and Agencies funded in this bill by \$432 million.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that committee amendments to H.R. 4121 be modified in accordance with the committee action of October.

I further ask unanimous consent that a revised bill be printed, reflecting the modifications just agreed to in the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee modification of its reported amendments to H.R. 4121, providing further reductions in budget authority and outlays, is as follows:

Page 2, line 15, strike \$36,007,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$35,029,000.

Page 3, line 1, strike \$22,300,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$20,149,000.

Page 3, line 11, strike \$14,279,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$12,566,000.

Page 3, line 15, strike \$209,304,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$153,826,000.

Page 3, line 23 strike \$148,850,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$120,473,000.

Page 5, line 19, strike \$52,206,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$45,941,000.

Page 6, line 4, strike \$206,625,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$184,000,000.

Page 6, line 14, strike \$168,436,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$148,224,000.

Page 6, line 20, strike \$864,772,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$812,886,000.

Page 7, line 3, strike \$933,513,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$901,813,000.

Page 7, line 12, strike \$617,428,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$602,628,000.

Page 7, line 17, strike \$500,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$440,000.

Page 11, line 11, strike \$946,240,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$869,240,000.

Page 12, line 15, strike \$13,200,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$12,210,000.

Page 13, line 6, strike \$22,278,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$19,664,000.

Page 14, line 7, strike \$1,640,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$1,443,000.

Page 14, line 12, strike \$2,263,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$2,035,000.

Page 14, line 18, strike \$2,959,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$2,604,000.

Page 14, line 23, strike \$3,939,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$3,496,000.

Page 15, line 7, strike \$37,651,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$33,416,000.

Page 15, line 12, strike \$2,628,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$2,453,000.

Page 15, line 17, strike \$1,000,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$880,000.

Page 16, line 2, strike \$1,212,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$1,095,000.

Page 16, line 8, strike \$1,822,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$1,751,000.

Page 16, line 12, strike \$218,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$192,000.

Page 16, line 19, strike \$621,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$546,000.

Page 24, line 15, strike \$134,142,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$118,925,000.

Page 24, line 20, strike \$16,330,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$15,166,000.

Page 25, line 5, strike \$91,000,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$79,294,000.

Page 25, line 16, strike \$13,399,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$11,791,000.

Page 26, line 6, strike \$47,000,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$41,658,000.

Page 26, line 18, strike \$100,000,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$60,000,000.

Page 27, line 11, strike \$134,031,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$119,878,000.

Page 27, line 20, strike \$20,131,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$17,715,000.

Page 31, line 10, strike \$117,462,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$105,424,000.

Page 33, line 5, strike \$15,037,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$13,233,000.

Page 33, line 20, strike \$4,373,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$3,848,000.

Page 34, line 6, strike \$16,000,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$14,795,000.

Page 34, line 15, strike \$12,404,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$11,000,000.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS, 1982

The Senate continued with the consideration of S. 1802.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment (UP No. 649). On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) would vote "nay."

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. SASSER), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) is absent because of illness.

I also announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN) is absent because of death in the family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 55, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 382 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Baucus	Dodd	Pell
Biden	Eagleton	Pressler
Bradley	Exon	Proxmire
Bumpers	Ford	Randolph
Burdick	Hatfield	Riegle
Byrd	Hollings	Rudman
Harry F., Jr.	Huddleston	Sarbanes
Byrd, Robert C.	Humphrey	Stennis
Cannon	Jepson	Warner
Chiles	Levin	Williams
Cranston	Long	Zorinsky
DeConcini	Melcher	
Dixon	Mitchell	

NAYS—55

Abdnor	Gorton	Metzenbaum
Andrews	Grassley	Nickles
Armstrong	Hart	Nunn
Baker	Hatch	Packwood
Bentsen	Hawkins	Percy
Boren	Hayakawa	Quayle
Boschwitz	Helms	Roth
Chafee	Inouye	Schmitt
Cochran	Jackson	Simpson
Cohen	Johnston	Specter
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Stafford
Danforth	Kasten	Stevens
Denton	Laxalt	Symms
Dole	Lugar	Thurmond
Domenici	Mathias	Tower
Durenberger	Matsunaga	Tsongas
East	Mattingly	Wallop
Garn	McClure	
Glenn		

NOT VOTING—9

Goldwater	Leahy	Pryor
Hefflin	Moynihan	Sasser
Kennedy	Murkowski	Weicker

So Mr. PELL's amendment (UP No. 649) was rejected.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator KENNEDY be listed as a cosponsor on the amendment by myself and Senator PERCY regarding funding for Poland and other countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ASSISTANCE TO LEBANON

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to ask two questions of the majority floor manager, Mr. KASTEN.

My questions concern our Government's fiscal year 1982 ESF assistance program for Lebanon. During the Senate's consideration of the foreign assistance authorization bill (S. 1196), this body agreed by a unanimous voice vote to an amendment concerning Lebanon offered by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY). The Kennedy amendment provided that of the ESF funds authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 1982, "\$ * * \$5,000,000 shall be available only for Lebanon for relief and rehabilitation programs of international and private voluntary agencies."

Is it the understanding of the Senator from Wisconsin that this \$5 million figure constitutes a floor for U.S. funding of the relief and rehabilitation activities in Lebanon of international and private voluntary agencies?

Mr. KASTEN. Yes, that is my understanding. In adopting the Kennedy amendment, the Senate acknowledged the great relief and rehabilitation needs of Lebanon and the special ability of private and international voluntary agencies to meet these needs in Lebanon.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it also the belief of the distinguished majority floor manager that the Kennedy amendment does not preclude the United States from providing ESF assistance to other programs in Lebanon which do not involve private and international voluntary agencies, should it see fit to do so? In other words, does my colleague from Wisconsin share my view that the intention of the Senate in adopting the \$5 million funding floor was to establish an adequate level of funding for PVO activities, but not at the expense of other worthwhile ESF programs?

Mr. KASTEN. Yes, that is my belief.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

(By request of Mr. PELL, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mr. MITCHELL) has stated, we sponsored and the Senate unanimously adopted an amendment to the foreign assistance authorization bill last September to provide \$5 million for relief and rehabilita-

tion assistance to Lebanon. Our action was taken in clear recognition of the plight of the thousands of Lebanese who have been victims of the fighting in that troubled land.

When the authorization bill passed the Senate, we noted that the \$5 million in relief assistance represented a small but important commitment to the rehabilitation of Lebanon. I am pleased that the Senate today is reaffirming our commitment to Lebanon and stating clearly that we expect the administration to use supplemental funds available in this appropriation bill to increase assistance to Lebanon.

I thank the floor manager of the bill for the understandings on this important point, and I am pleased to join with my good friend Senator MITCHELL in the further understandings achieved today. ●

Mr. HAYAKAWA. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 1802, the foreign assistance appropriations bill.

Security and development assistance are essential components of U.S. national security and foreign policy. Both serve our long-range interest of providing a stable international environment by assisting our friends and allies to acquire and maintain the means with which to prevent major economic crises and deter external aggression. The Soviet Union has, through an unparalleled buildup of conventional and nuclear forces and assistance to client states, posed increasing challenges to our important interests in East Asia and the Pacific, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. The United States must continue its efforts to develop a coherent strategy that will counter the Soviet challenge by both strengthening our military forces and providing economic and security assistance to those nations which share our objectives of world peace and international cooperation.

In East Asia our interests are significant. The region contains a large reservoir of raw materials which supply the industrial base of the Western democracies with tin, rubber, tungsten, titanium, and zirconium. And, some of the world's most important searoutes pass through the region carrying the vital flow of petroleum from the Middle East to our Asian allies: Japan, the Philippines, and Australia.

Meanwhile the growth of Soviet military and naval forces in the area is increasingly troubling. The Soviet Union maintains 44 divisions in Asia and nearly 2,000 aircraft. The Soviet Navy also has been expanding far beyond the U.S.S.R.'s own defensive needs. About one-third of Moscow's submarine force now operates in the Pacific and there are reports that submarines armed with cruise missiles are in the vicinity of the strategic Straits of Malacca, so vital to allied shipping concerns. The Soviet threat to the searoutes is further increased by its access to Vietnam's naval base at Cam Ranh Bay.

The biggest immediate threat to peace and security in Asia is Vietnam, whose Soviet-supplied troops now occupy Cambodia and operate in strength along the Thai-Cambodian border. Thailand's major priority must be to defend itself against this experienced and well-

equipped force of 80,000. In addition to its military burdens, Thailand is also faced with providing sustenance for the ever-increasing number of Vietnamese, Lao, and Khmer refugees who have sought sanctuary within its borders.

Mr. President, I believe S. 1802 is an important step forward in our efforts to secure U.S. strategic interests in the Pacific and to protect the immediate security of our Asian allies. The bill proposes to increase certain aspects of security assistance in response to Soviet challenges in the area and to provide continued funding for Thailand, the Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, and Burma with consideration for the special increased needs of these countries. The bill also recognizes the importance of assisting projects specifically planned to address basic human needs in agriculture, education and health care.

I want to commend S. 1802 for recognizing Thailand's strained resources as a "front-line" state and for encouraging the administration to provide for the repayment of its military assistance over an extended period of time. I also want to commend S. 1802 for providing for the full funding of the international military and education program, a program which not only trains foreign military personnel about military organization, tactics, strategy, command, and control but also enlightens them about the political and social advantages of democratic institutions. The hundreds of thousands of foreign military personnel who have and will participate in the IMET program are important channels through which we can further our goals of encouraging freedom and preserving human rights.

Security and economic assistance are vital parts of a sound strategic posture. We must increase these efforts if we are to halt Soviet aggression and if we are to provide a framework for cooperation between the United States and those countries which feel threatened by an expanding Soviet military presence.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, S. 1802 as reported by the Appropriations Committee provides new budget authority of \$11.5 billion for fiscal year 1982. Of this amount, more than one-third is designated for the Export-Import Bank.

With possible late requirements for the October 1981 pay raise and the administration's request for a special defense fund, the reported bill is \$0.7 billion below the subcommittee's budget authority allocation under the first budget resolution and \$0.1 billion below the subcommittee's outlay allocation.

The credit guarantee limitation on the Export-Import Bank in the reported bill is \$1 billion above the credit budget assumptions of the first budget resolution. This increase could result in higher budget outlays in future years.

The Senate bill is \$0.4 billion in budget authority and \$0.1 billion in outlays above the House-reported bill, with possible later requirements taken into account.

The President's September budget request for programs and activities funded in this bill, with later requirements, represents roughly a 12-percent reduction in budget authority and a 2-percent reduc-

tion in outlays from his March budget request. The Senate-reported bill is about 8 percent in budget authority and 2 percent in outlays below the levels requested by the administration in March.

In both cases, about one-third of the reduction was accomplished by moving \$0.5 billion from the on-budget direct credit program for foreign military sales (FMS) to the off-budget FMS guarantee program. This procedure is not consistent with sound budgetary practice.

With later requirements, the Senate reported bill exceeds the President's September budget request by \$0.5 billion in budget authority and \$0.1 billion in outlays.

The bill provides increases of \$0.8 billion for the Export-Import Bank, \$0.03 billion for voluntary contributions to international organizations and programs, and \$0.02 billion for Peace Corps over the levels requested by the President in September. These increases are partially offset by decreases of \$0.3 billion for the various multilateral development banks and \$0.1 billion for bilateral development assistance and refugee programs.

The bill, as reported, however, is consistent with the authorization levels and other provisions of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the relationship of the reported bill, together with possible later requirements, to the congressional budget and the President's budget requests be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Foreign Operations Subcommittee
[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1982	
	BA	O
Outlays from prior-year budget authority and other actions completed	0.1	6.0
S. 1802 (H.R. 4559, as reported in Senate)	11.5	3.3
Possible later requirements:		
Special Defense Acquisition Fund	0.3	0.02
October 1981 pay raise	0.01	0.01
Total for Foreign Operations Subcommittee	12.0	9.2
First budget resolution		
level	12.7	9.3
House level (as reported)	11.6	9.1
President's March request	13.1	9.4
President's September request	11.5	9.2
Foreign Operations Subcommittee compared to:		
First budget resolution		
level	-0.7	-0.1
House level	+0.4	+0.1
President's March request	-1.1	-0.2
President's September request	+0.5	+0.1

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I know of no further amendments on either side on this bill, and I move we go to third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any further amendments? If there are no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and to be read a third time. The bill was read the third time.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there will be no more rollcall votes this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill, as amended, pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER), are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. SASSER), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), is absent because of illness.

I also announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN), is absent because of death in the family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any Senator in the Chamber who wishes to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 383 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Baker	Garn	Metzenbaum
Baucus	Glenn	Mitchell
Bentsen	Gorton	Murkowski
Biden	Hart	Nunn
Boschwitz	Hawkins	Packwood
Bradley	Hayakawa	Pell
Bumpers	Heinz	Percy
Chafee	Huddleston	Quayle
Chiles	Inouye	Riegle
Cochran	Jackson	Rudman
Cohen	Jepsen	Sarbanes
Cranston	Johnston	Simpson
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Specter
Danforth	Kasten	Stafford
Denton	Levin	Stevens
Dixon	Lugar	Thurmond
Dodd	Mathias	Tsongas
Dole	Matsunaga	Wallop
Durenberger	Mattingly	Williams

NAYS—33

Abdnor	East	Melcher
Andrews	Exon	Nickles
Armstrong	Ford	Pressler
Boren	Grassley	Proxmire
Burdick	Hatch	Randolph
Byrd	Hatfield	Roth
Byrd, Jr.	Harry F., Jr.	Schmitt
Byrd, Robert C.	Hollings	Symms
Cannon	Humphrey	Warner
DeConcini	Laxalt	Zorinsky
Domenici	Long	
Eagleton	McClure	

NOT VOTING—10

Goldwater	MoyNIHAN	Tower
Hefflin	Pryor	Weicker
Kennedy	Sasser	
Leahy	Stennis	

So the bill (S. 1802), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 1802

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any

money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

For payment to the Inter-American Development Bank by the Secretary of the Treasury, for the United States share of the replenishment of the resources of the Fund for Special Operations, as authorized by the Act of June 3, 1980 (Public Law 96-259), \$173,177,000, to remain available until expended; and \$48,053,477, for the United States share of the increase in subscriptions to the paid-in capital stock, as authorized by the Act of June 3, 1980 (Public Law 96-259), to remain available until expended.

LIMITATION ON CALLABLE CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

The United States Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank may subscribe without fiscal year limitation to the callable capital portion of the United States share of such increase in capital stock in an amount not to exceed \$609,582,129.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

For payment to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development by the Secretary of the Treasury, for the United States share of the increase in subscriptions to the paid-in capital stock, as authorized by the International Financial Institutions Act, \$37,168,491, to remain available until expended, and \$109,720,549 for the General Capital Increase, as authorized by section 39 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, to remain available until expended.

LIMITATION ON CALLABLE CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

The United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development may subscribe without fiscal year limitation to the callable portion of the United States share of such increases in capital stock in an amount not to exceed \$1,687,728,491.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

For payment to the International Finance Corporation by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$14,447,900, for the United States share of the increase in subscriptions to capital stock, as authorized by the International Financial Institutions Act, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

For payment to the International Development Association by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$532,000,000, for the second installment of the United States contribution to the sixth replenishment, as authorized by section 17 of the International Development Association Act, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

For payment to the Asian Development Bank by the Secretary of the Treasury, for the United States share of the increase in subscriptions to the paid-in capital stock, as authorized by the International Financial Institutions Act, \$4,713,851, to remain available until expended; and for the United States contribution to the increase in resources of the Asian Development Fund, as authorized by the Act of June 3, 1980 (Public Law 96-259), \$111,250,000, to remain available until expended; and as authorized by the International Financial Institutions Act, \$7,847,869, to remain available until expended.

LIMITATION ON CALLABLE CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

The United States Governor of the Asian Development Bank may subscribe without fiscal year limitation to the callable capital portion of the United States share of such increase in capital stock in an amount not to exceed \$42,632,409.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND

For payment to the African Development Fund by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$41,666,667, as authorized by the Act of June 3, 1980 (Public Law 96-259), for the United States contribution to the second replenishment of the African Development Fund, to remain available until expended.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and of section 2 of the United Nations Environment Program Participation Act of 1973, \$218,638,000: *Provided*, That not less than \$134,500,000 shall be available only for the United Nations Development Program: *Provided further*, That not more than \$38,000,000 shall be available for the United Nations Children's Fund: *Provided further*, That not more than \$7,500,000 shall be available for the United Nations Environment Program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be available for the United Nations Institute for Namibia, except if the President determines and submits in writing to Congress that providing such funds will promote an internationally recognized settlement in Namibia.

TITLE II—BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes, to remain available until September 30, 1982, unless otherwise specified herein, as follows:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Agriculture, rural development, and nutrition, Development Assistance: For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 103, \$637,485,000: *Provided*, That of this amount the funds provided for loans shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1983.

Population, Development Assistance: For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 104(b), \$190,000,000: *Provided*, That of this amount the funds provided for loans shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1983: *Provided further*, That not more than \$32,000,000 shall be available for the United Nations Fund for Population Activities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be available for the World Health Organization's Special Program of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction.

Health, Development Assistance: For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 104(c), \$120,405,000: *Provided*, That of this amount the funds provided for loans shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1983.

Education and human resources development, Development Assistance: For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 105, \$101,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be available for scholarships for South African students in accordance with the last sentence of section 105(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as added by title III of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1981): *Provided further*, That of this amount the funds provided for loans shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1983.

Energy and selected development activities, Development Assistance: For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of sections 106 and 107, \$120,000,000: *Provided*, That of this amount the funds provided for loans shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1983.

Loan allocation, Development Assistance: Of the new obligational authority appropriated under this Act to carry out the provisions of sections 103 through 107, not less than \$316,265,300 shall be available for loans for the fiscal year 1982: *Provided*, That loans made pursuant to this authority to countries whose annual per capita gross national product is greater than \$730 but less than \$1,180 shall be repayable within twenty-five years following the date on which funds are initially made available under such loans and loans to countries whose annual per capita gross national product is greater than or equal to \$1,180 shall be repayable within twenty years following the date on which funds are initially made available under such loans.

American schools and hospitals abroad: For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 214, \$12,000,000.

International disaster assistance: For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 491, \$27,000,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this paragraph, not less than \$10,000,000 shall be used for earthquake relief and reconstruction in southern Italy.

Sahel development program: For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 121, \$92,515,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of such appropriation may be available to make any contribution of the United States to the Sahel development program in excess of 10 per centum of the total contributions to such program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be used for the African Development Foundation.

Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund: For payment to the "Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund", as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1980, \$32,552,000.

Economic support fund: For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II, \$2,623,500,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this paragraph not less than \$806,000,000 shall be available for Israel, not less than \$771,000,000 shall be available for Egypt, not less than \$100,000,000 shall be available for Sudan, not less than \$5,000,000 for Poland, not less than \$5,000,000 for Tunisia, and not less than \$15,000,000 for Costa Rica: *Provided further*, That not more than \$7,500,000 shall be available for Cyprus: *Provided further*, That \$2,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available only for scholarships for South African students in accordance with the last sentence of section 105(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as added by title III of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1981).

Peacekeeping operations: For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 551, \$14,000,000.

Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development: For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 667, \$331,000,000.

Trade and development: For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 661, \$6,907,000.

Housing and other credit guaranty programs: During the fiscal year 1982, total commitments to guarantee loans shall not exceed \$150,000,000 of contingent liability for loan principal.

International narcotics control: For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 481, \$34,160,000.

USE OF CERTAIN POLISH CURRENCIES

Subject to the enactment of authorizing legislation, during the fiscal year 1982, the equivalent in currency or credit of \$70,000,000 in Polish zlotys (received by the United States from the April 1981 sale of United States Government-held dairy products to Poland) shall be available for use in Poland to serve United States interests, including use for activities of common benefit to the people of the United States and the people of Poland, such as joint programs in energy, agriculture, education, science, health, and culture, or for humanitarian activities.

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the Inter-American Foundation in accordance with the provisions of section 401 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations, as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, \$12,000,000.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

The Overseas Private Investment Corporation is authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds available to it and in accordance with law (including not to exceed \$8,000 for entertainment allowances), and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations, as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 849), as may be necessary in carrying out the program set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year.

During the fiscal year 1982 and within the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the amount of direct loans shall be not less than \$9,950,000 or more than \$10,000,000.

During the fiscal year 1982, total commitments to guarantee loans shall be not less than \$99,950,000 or more than \$100,000,000 of contingent liability for loan principal.

INDEPENDENCE AGENCY

PEACE CORPS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), \$105,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to pay for abortions.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the Secretary of State to provide, as authorized by law, a contribution to the International Committee of the Red Cross and assistance to refugees, including contributions to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; salaries and expenses of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1980, allowances as authorized by sections 5921 through 5925 of title 5, United States Code; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; \$473,000,000: *Provided*, That these funds shall be administered in a manner that insures equity in the treatment of all refugees receiving Federal assistance: *Provided further*, That no funds herein appropriated shall be used to assist directly in the migration to any nation in the Western Hemisphere of any person not having a security clearance based on reasonable standards to insure against Communist infiltration in the Western Hemisphere: *Provided further*, That not more than \$7,426,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be avail-

able for the administrative expenses of the Office of Refugee Programs of the Department of State.

TITLE III—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 503 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, including administrative expenses and purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only for use outside of the United States, \$63,500,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1983.

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 541 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, \$41,976,000.

FOREIGN MILITARY CREDIT SALES

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of sections 23 and 24 of the Arms Export Control Act, \$990,900,000: *Provided*, That of the amount provided for the total aggregate credit sale ceiling during the current fiscal year, not less than \$1,400,000,000 shall be allocated to Israel.

During the fiscal year 1982 and within the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, exclusive of loan guaranty defaults, shall not exceed \$990,900,000.

During the fiscal year 1982, total commitments to guarantee loans shall not exceed \$3,083,500,000 of contingent liability for loan principal.

SPECIAL DEFENSE ACQUISITION FUND

There are authorized to be made available for the special Defense Acquisition Fund for the fiscal year 1982, \$341,000,000.

TITLE IV—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

The Export-Import Bank of the United States is authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such corporation, and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations, as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as may be necessary in carrying out the program set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation: *Provided*, That none of the funds available during the current fiscal year may be used to make expenditures, contracts, or commitments for the export of nuclear equipment, fuel, or technology to any country that has detonated a nuclear explosive after the date of enactment of this Act other than a nuclear-weapon State, as defined in Article IX of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and that is eligible to receive economic or military assistance under this Act.

LIMITATION ON PROGRAM ACTIVITY

During the fiscal year 1982 and within the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans shall be not less than \$4,695,000,000 nor more than \$4,700,000,000. During the fiscal year 1982, total commitments to guarantee loans shall be not less than \$9,215,000,000 nor more than \$9,220,000,000 of contingent liability for loan principal.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$15,115,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) shall be available during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) fees or dues to international organizations of credit institutions engaged in financing foreign trade, (2)

necessary expenses (including special services performed on a contract or a fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Export-Import Bank or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, or the investigation or appraisal of any property in respect to which an application for a loan has been made, and (3) expenses (other than internal expenses of the Export-Import Bank) incurred in connection with the issuance and servicing of guarantees, insurance, and reinsurance, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes of this paragraph.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. None of the funds appropriated in this Act (other than funds appropriated for "International organizations and programs") shall be used to finance the construction of any new flood control, reclamation, or other water or related land resource project or program which has not met the standards and criteria used in determining the feasibility of flood control, reclamation, and other water and related land resource programs and projects proposed for construction within the United States of America under the Principles and Standards for Planning Water and Related Land Resources dated October 25, 1973.

Sec. 502. Except for the appropriations entitled "International disaster assistance", "United States emergency refugee and migration assistance fund" and the special requirements fund within the appropriations entitled "Military Assistance" and the special requirements fund within the appropriations entitled "Economic support fund", not more than 15 per centum of any appropriation item made available by this Act for the fiscal year 1982 shall be obligated or reserved during the last month of availability.

Sec. 503. None of the funds appropriated in this Act nor any of the counterpart funds generated as a result of assistance hereunder or any prior Act shall be used to pay pensions, annuities, retirement pay, or adjusted service compensation for any persons heretofore or hereafter serving in the armed forces of any recipient country.

Sec. 504. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, may be used for making payments on any contract for procurement to which the United States is a party entered into after the date of enactment of this Act which does not contain a provision authorizing the termination of such contract for the convenience of the United States.

Sec. 505. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, may be used to pay in whole or in part any assessments, arrearages, or dues of any member of the United Nations.

Sec. 506. None of the funds contained in title II of this Act may be used to carry out the provisions of section 209(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Sec. 507. Of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act, not to exceed \$100,000 shall be for representation allowances of the Agency for International Development during the fiscal year 1982: *Provided*, That appropriate steps shall be taken to assure that, to the maximum extent possible, United States-owned foreign currencies are utilized in lieu of dollars: *Provided further*, That of the total funds made available by this Act under the headings "Military Assistance" and "Foreign Military Credit Sales", not to exceed \$4,000 shall be available for entertainment expenses and not to exceed \$138,500 shall be available for

representation allowances: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available by this Act under the heading "International Military Education and Training", not to exceed \$125,000 shall be available for entertainment allowances: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available by this Act for the Inter-American Foundation, not to exceed \$2,500 shall be available for entertainment and representation allowances. *Provided further*, That of the funds made available by this Act for the Peace Corps, not to exceed a total of \$4,000 shall be available for entertainment expenses.

Sec. 508. None of the funds appropriated or made available (other than funds for "International organizations and programs") pursuant to this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, may be used to finance the export of nuclear equipment, fuel, or technology or to provide assistance for the training of foreign nationals in nuclear fields.

Sec. 509. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be obligated or expended to provide assistance to any country for the purpose of aiding the efforts of the government of such country to repress the legitimate rights of the population of such country contrary to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Sec. 510. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance directly any assistance to Mozambique, except that the President may waive this prohibition if he determines, and so reports to the Congress, that furnishing such assistance would further the foreign policy interests of the United States.

Sec. 511. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance directly any assistance or reparations to Angola, Cambodia, Cuba, Laos, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, or Syria.

Sec. 512. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated under an appropriation account to which they were not appropriated without the written prior approval of the Appropriations Committees and the relevant authorizing committees of both Houses of the Congress.

Sec. 513. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not authorized before the date of enactment of this Act by the Congress.

Sec. 514. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation after the expiration of the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided in this Act.

Sec. 515. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to furnish assistance to any country which is in default during a period in excess of one calendar year in payment to the United States of principal or interest on any loan made to such country by the United States pursuant to a program for which funds are appropriated under this Act.

Sec. 516. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act shall be available to any international financial institution whose United States' representative cannot upon request obtain the amounts and the names of borrowers for all loans of the international financial institution, including loans to employees of the institution, or the compensation and related benefits of employees of the institution.

Sec. 517. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act shall be available to any international financial institution whose United States' representative cannot upon request obtain any document developed by the management of the international financial institutions.

Sec. 518. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to the Export-Import Bank and funds appro-

priated by this Act for direct foreign assistance may be obligated for any government which aids or abets, by granting sanctuary from prosecution to, any individual or group which has committed or is being sought by any other government for prosecution for any war crime or an act of international terrorism, unless the President finds that the national security requires otherwise.

Sec. 519. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act for direct assistance and none of the funds otherwise made available pursuant to this Act to the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall be obligated or expended to finance any loan, any assistance or any other financial commitments for establishing or expanding production of any commodity for export by any country other than the United States, if the commodity is likely to be in surplus on world markets at the time the resulting productive capacity is expected to become operative and if the assistance will cause substantial injury to United States producers of the same, similar, or competing commodity: *Provided*, That such prohibition shall not apply to the Export-Import Bank if in the judgment of its Board of Directors the benefits to industry and employment in the United States are likely to outweigh the injury to United States producers of the same, similar, or competing commodity.

Sec. 520. The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States executive directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Finance Corporation, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the African Development Bank, and the African Development Fund to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose any assistance by these institutions, using funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act, for the production of any commodity for export, if it is in surplus on world markets and if the assistance will cause substantial injury to United States producers of the same, similar, or competing commodity.

Sec. 521. None of the funds made available under this Act for "Agriculture, rural development, and nutrition, Development Assistance," "Population, Development Assistance," "Health, Development Assistance," "Education and human resources development, Development Assistance," "Energy, private voluntary organizations, and selected development activities, Development Assistance," "Science and technology, Development Assistance," "International organizations and programs," "American schools and hospitals abroad," "Trade and development program," "Sahel development program," "International narcotics control," "Economic support fund," "Peacekeeping operations," "Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development," "Military assistance," "International military education and training," "Foreign military credit sales," "Inter-American Foundation," "Peace Corps," or "Migration and refugee assistance," shall be available for obligation for activities, programs, projects, type of materiel assistance, countries, or other operation not justified or in excess of the amount justified to the Appropriations Committees for obligation under any of these specific headings for the fiscal year 1982 unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are previously notified fifteen days in advance.

This Act may be cited as the "Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1982".

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond the hour of 7:25 p.m., in which Senators may speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION NEEDS

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I should like to note my support for the improvements at Ellsworth Air Force Base which were recently funded by the Senate's fiscal year 1982 military construction authorization bill.

A total of \$36,880,000 is approved for major construction activities at Ellsworth, which is a key Strategic Air Command base located near Rapid City, S. Dak. These projects include an air-launched cruise missile facility, a flight simulator facility, and upgrading of the base's sewage treatment facilities.

In addition to these major projects, funds have also been provided for smaller construction projects which include an energy conservation investment program.

Mr. President, these are all badly needed construction projects at this important airbase. It is significant that the Ellsworth construction program recommended by this bill is second in size among all SAC bases inside the United States. That is, only one other SAC base in the United States would have more military construction under the provisions of this bill.

I point out, however, that much more work needs to be done to put Ellsworth AFB in a condition warranted by its strategic importance. I have inspected Ellsworth facilities on several occasions and have been briefed at length on what needs to be done to further strengthen the mission capability of this installation.

It is my hope that the fiscal year 1983 through fiscal year 1986 budget requests for Ellsworth will include funding for a much needed single enlisted persons barracks or dormitory, as well as funding of a new vehicle maintenance building and a security headquarters building.

Also, although the base maintenance and repair funding falls outside the scope of the military construction bill, it is important to note that the backlog of BMAR projects is still very substantial—both at Ellsworth and at other U.S. military facilities at home and around the world.

I am one who believes that we should be very careful not to allow funding for exotic new weapons programs, some of which could even be obsolete before they are ready for operation, to drive down funding for the essential nuts and bolts of our national defense.

This includes doing maintenance and repair work on a timely basis, so that bases like Ellsworth are not faced with ultimately costlier replacement construction.

ARMS CONTROL NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the letter sent by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON to President Reagan on March 24, 1981. In this letter, our distinguished colleague from the State of Washington articulates clearly and concisely the pressing need for the United States to engage in serious and comprehensive arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union.

He correctly envisions such an effort to be an essential part of a major peace offensive in which we must engage if we are to deny the Soviets the propaganda advantage they are currently exploiting to such good effect in Europe.

Since this letter was sent, events in Europe and the United States have added further impetus to the suggestions made by Senator JACKSON. Even those of us who have long admired and followed with interest the record of this great American legislator and pioneer in the field of arms control are struck by the prescience and timeliness of Senator JACKSON's remarks.

Since the Senator's letter was sent, President Reagan has proposed a program designed to modernize and restore credibility to our strategic deterrent. The President's program is an essential parallel to our policy of seeking meaningful and equitable limitations on strategic weapons at reduced levels.

In fact, I am convinced that the President's program is a necessary prerequisite for the achievement of such limitations—only a strong and balanced program of strategic force modernization will provide the incentive for the Soviets to negotiate sound and verifiable arms control agreements.

The concerns cited in the Jackson letter and the recommendations made therein provide a valuable background for all Members of the Senate on the eve of President Reagan's foreign policy address scheduled for tomorrow, November 18, 1981.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Senator JACKSON's letter and its enclosures be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1981.
The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Following up on my recent talk with you, I want to underscore the importance of your launching a dramatic, sustained American peace offensive at a very early opportunity.

I welcome the emphasis you have put on the goal of East-West arms reduction. I am persuaded the time is ripe for you to put forward a bold and imaginative proposal for serious arms reductions—a proposal challenging the Soviets to join with us in concluding an arms reduction agreement in a manner that enhances stability in the nuclear balance at sharply reduced levels of strategic forces.

We should not allow the Soviets to preempt the issue of peace. Right or wrong, our allies—particularly in Western Europe—are of the view that our country and the new Administration are unwilling to play a responsible role in the restraint of nuclear arms. You and I know this is not true, but

it is a bad perception which the Soviet leaders exploit.

The fact is the Soviets are making headway with their peace propaganda among our allies in Europe; they are getting a free ride with their depiction of you and the United States as war-loving. Certain circles in West Europe, especially left-wing elements, have fallen under Moscow's spell, and are having an influence on the leadership of parties and governments out of all proportion to their numbers.

What is missing is a relentless drive on our part to shift to our side the initiative for peace—for real peace and stabilizing arms reductions. Let the Soviets respond and react to U.S. proposals—repeated, repeated and repeated. Make Moscow at least show its true colors.

This country is determined, under your leadership, to revitalize its defenses and enhance deterrence. But we do this because the defense of freedom leaves us no alternative. We are a people of peace. We take no satisfaction in channeling the genius of this nation into the building of armaments. We would far rather participate in programs for enhancing the quality of life and ending poverty and disease for decent people everywhere.

This is the down-to-earth truth that President Eisenhower sought to convey to the world in his famous address of April 16, 1953. It is the truth that I believe you should now emphasize—by a far-reaching, innovative drive on behalf of serious mutual arms reductions.

The point is that strategic forces on both sides are larger than they need to be, provided that we can negotiate with the Soviets toward a common ceiling at a sharply lower level.

The urgent task of your Administration is to fashion a plan and strategy that would provide for the mutual reduction of Soviet and American strategic nuclear forces in a stabilizing manner. Some of our friends and allies believe that any smaller number of nuclear weapons is better than a bigger number. Obviously this is not so; what counts are matters of size, deliverability, accuracy, vulnerability, mix, balance and the like. I am confident it is not beyond the capacity of your Administration to develop a responsible proposal that if agreed to by the Soviets would provide a long-term stabilization of the strategic balance on the basis of equality at a reduced level of deterrence.

I do not foresee the Soviet leaders initially welcoming such an effort. In 1974 I outlined and urged a SALT proposal to stabilize the strategic balance through substantial reductions in U.S. and USSR strategic forces.

In mid-February 1977, after meeting with President Carter and at his request, I supplied him with a detailed analysis of the severely flawed nature of the then current SALT II draft text, advising a fresh start based on salvaging a more balanced, equal agreement to avoid winding up with a disastrous, unacceptable result that would widen and deepen the Soviet strategic margin still more.

In March 1977, President Carter proposed in the SALT talks certain mutual force reductions and a ban on the deployment of new ICBM's. While I had no responsibility for his specific proposals, once they were offered, I strongly supported them. But the Administration retreated at the first Soviet objection; it did not even try to convince the Russians.

And the SALT II treaty turned out to be an unequal charter for a massive Soviet strategic buildup. Far from putting a damper on the arms competition, it added fuel to the fire.

I am under no illusion about the difficulty of negotiating a fair and balanced arms reduction treaty with the Soviets. It will take hard bargaining, patience and time. Certainly, one speech won't do it—that is just

the kickoff. The campaign must be pressed month after month, year after year if necessary. But our nation should not be deterred from championing a noble cause only because our adversaries may continue to act ignobly.

Such a genuine peace offensive on our part is an honorable counter to the shabby Kremlin slogans of peace and plenty. It will clarify to our friends and allies our dedication to stabilizing nuclear arms reduction negotiations. As a minimum, it will put Moscow on the propaganda defensive. It keeps open the possibility of achieving over time real and significant steps in the direction of such a stabilizing disarmament.

At a time when the Soviet economy is in deep difficulty, we can make a convincing case that a redirection of their emphasis away from the military sector is the best way to improve their economic well-being.

If our initiative proved successful, it would permit both sides to shift resources from the buildup of nuclear arsenals to the building up of their economies. It could mean billions of dollars in savings on strategic weapons systems. It could alleviate the atmosphere of mistrust and fear that has for so long clouded East-West relations. The energy of our peoples could be devoted to purposes more constructive and more enduring than the amassing of nuclear weapons—to the struggle against hunger and disease and human squalor, to the provision of houses instead of silos, tractors instead of ICBM's, and medicines instead of nuclear explosives. It would be a turning point in East-West relations of historic proportions.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing a speech I delivered on the Senate Floor on May 1, 1953 in support of President Eisenhower's plan for "real disarmament." I am also including an April 22, 1974 address which was my effort at that time to articulate the American vision of a peaceful world, and to assure our bargaining position for stabilizing, mutual arms reduction.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senator.

Enclosures.

REMARKS OF SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON

Mr. President: Not every member of this body will subscribe to every last sentence of the foreign policy address the President of the United States delivered on April 16. But when the President offered the world a plan for the regulation of armaments and the use of the monies thereby saved for assistance to the economically underdeveloped areas of the world, I believe he spoke for all of us—Republicans and Democrats alike. The President's words were these:

"This government is ready to ask its people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of any savings achieved by real disarmament to a fund for world aid and reconstruction. The purposes of this great work would be: To help other peoples to develop the underdeveloped areas of the world, to stimulate profitable and fair world trade, to assist all peoples to know the blessings of productive freedom.

"The monuments of this new kind of war would be these: Roads and schools, hospitals and homes, food and health.

"We are ready, in short, to dedicate our strength to serving the needs, rather than the fears, of the world."

In saying this, the President gave voice to the longings in the heart of every good American. This nation of ours is determined, grimly determined, to build every single tank and plane and atomic bomb needed to punish aggression and prevent World War III. But we do this because the defense of freedom leaves us no alternative. We are a people of peace. We take no satisfaction in channeling the genits of this nation into the building

of sterile armaments. We would rather, far rather, be participating in great programs for lifting poverty and disease from the shoulders of decent people everywhere.

It is this down-to-earth truth that the President's speech tried to make known to the world.

You will recall, Mr. President, that three years ago, and again in 1951, our late and beloved colleague, Senator Erlen McMahon, sponsored a resolution asking the Senate to go on record as supporting the objectives outlined in the President's speech of April 16—the objectives of rascal-proof regulation of weapons production, and the use of resources thereby saved for constructive tasks on a world-wide basis.

Senators from both sides of the aisle joined with Brien McMahon in sponsoring Senate Concurrent Resolution 47. Along with Republicans and other Democrats, I introduced an identical resolution in the House of Representatives at the same time. This resolution proposed:

"That the Congress of the United States advocate and recommend an immediate special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations for the single purpose of stopping the armaments race by speeding agreement upon effective and enforceable disarmament and control covering conventional armaments, biological and chemical agents, and atomic and hydrogen bombs;

"That the Congress of the United States, as tangible evidence of its good faith, pledge itself to appropriate and to make available to the United Nations—when an effective and enforceable system of world-wide disarmament and control takes effect—a substantial portion of all money saved for a period of five years, such sums to be expended by the United Nations for peaceful development of atomic energy, technical assistance programs to underdeveloped areas, and general economic aid and assistance to all war-ravaged countries."

It may well be that President Eisenhower's words were inspired by recollection of this resolution. But this is of little import—Brien McMahon took no pride of authorship in his plan for peace with justice.

I need not remind this chamber that no person of our generation worked harder to enlarge the armed might of the United States than Senator McMahon. It was my privilege to sit on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy while he served as its honored Chairman. I observed his total dedication to the twin cause of multiplying our atomic strength and, hand in hand with this, finding some way of abolishing these frightful armaments, and all other weapons as well, from the arsenals of the world.

When he peered into the future, Brien McMahon saw what the President of the United States saw. He saw what all of us must see, unless we close our eyes to the meaning of the onrushing arms competition. If the road before us continues without turning, the future promises at best a world living in fear of annihilation—a world in which our treasures are drained away in the manufacture of weapons which cannot feed a single hungry person or ease the pain of a single man or woman racked by disease. And that is the best we can hope for if armaments continue piling up on both sides of the Iron Curtain at an accelerating rate. If history is to be our guide, we must assume that eventually such an armaments race will spill over to outright global war.

In truth, the future holds only two eventual alternatives: atomic war—a war made hideous beyond imagination by the new destroyers of men and all their workers, or atomic peace—a peace made rich beyond imagination by the power of modern science and technology freed for peaceful tasks.

Mr. President, I will now reintroduce Senate Concurrent Resolution 47. A resolution of identical wording has already been re-

introduced in the House. Senators from both parties are joining with me in this resolution. I am particularly proud to have as one of my co-sponsors the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senior Senator from Wisconsin.

I would not presume for an instant to predict that the Soviet rulers will be willing to join with us and the other nations of the free world in a plan for carrying on a world-wide crusade against hunger and disease and human squalor. I see nothing in the conduct of the new Soviet regime which would make for confidence on this score.

Yet I cannot believe that our nation must be deterred from subscribing to a noble goal simply because our adversaries may continue to act ignobly. This country has prospered and grown great in the service of noble causes, and we can forget this only at our peril.

As a minimum, moreover, the resolution on whose behalf I now speak will let men everywhere know who bears the responsibility for the fears and tensions that now beset the world. It tells the Kremlin: Put up or shut up. If this resolution is adopted by the Congress, and if the Soviet rulers refuse to join in a program which will give the world tractors instead of tanks, houses instead of barracks, and medicines in place of explosives—if the Kremlin refuses to become partner to such a program, the communist slogans of peace and plenty will become a mockery.

I urge with all the power at my command that every member of the Senate, by supporting this resolution, now unite behind the President of the United States in our quest for lasting peace.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 23, 1974]

ARMS REDUCTION, DETENTE AND SALT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as Senator JACKSON said in his address of April 22 to the Overseas Press Club:

"The issue facing us is not whether we want a détente, but how to achieve a real détente that will produce results favorable to a more peaceful world."

We are now negotiating with the Soviets in SALT II, and the outcome of these negotiations can decisively affect the real meaning détente will have. I believe it is of the utmost importance that SALT II follow a course that is consistent with the national security of the United States and the prospects for a SALT II Treaty based on United States-Soviet equality.

In this spirit, Senator JACKSON has set forth a U.S. SALT proposal to stabilize the strategic balance through substantial reductions in the strategic forces of both the United States and the Soviet Union. As he said:

"It is time for serious arms reductions by both sides—a stabilizing disarmament."

I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the full text of Senator JACKSON's constructive and statesman-like address. I urge the widest reading of his remarks. If agreed to, Senator JACKSON's program would mark an historic turning point in East-West relations, and could dramatically increase the confidence of all the world's people in the prospects for a cooperative and stable peace.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Senator JACKSON's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETENTE AND SALT

(By Senator HENRY M. JACKSON)

In recent years, and especially in recent months, the foreign policy of the Nixon Administration has been centered on the development of a relationship between East

and West which they have called detente. No matter how hard or in which direction it has been punched—in the Middle East, in the SALT negotiations, on matters of human rights—the foreign policy of the Administration has revolved, like a tether ball, around the pole of that detente.

The detente has gone from a dream to an incantation without acquiring a definition along the way. And we have been left without a clear sense of where we are going or, for that matter, a common understanding of where we have been.

In its most fundamental sense detente must mean a relaxation of tensions accompanied by an effort to achieve mutual accommodation through the negotiating process. Defined in this manner, as a process of negotiation, it has the broad support of the American people. But like any process, the process of detente must be judged by the substantive results of the negotiations themselves and by the actual behavior that follows after agreements are negotiated.

Thus the issue facing us is not whether we want a detente, but how to achieve a real detente that will produce results favorable to a more peaceful world.

The centerpiece of the 1972 Moscow summit and the first test of the product of detente was the treaty on anti-ballistic missiles and the interim agreement on strategic offensive weapons—SALT I. I had considerable misgivings about the SALT I outcome, especially the interim agreement. The military advantage that the interim agreement conferred on the Soviets was in my judgment, an inauspicious beginning.

Now we are engaged in SALT II and it is this set of negotiations, perhaps more than any other, that will determine what real meaning detente will have. I welcome this opportunity to share with you a proposal that could stabilize the strategic balance through substantial reductions in the strategic forces of both the United States and the Soviet Union. In the course of my remarks tonight, which are directed to the SALT II negotiations, I have tried to develop a new direction in the effort to bring strategic arms under control—a direction based on the search for the sort of wide-ranging disarmament that would do much to bring us closer to a genuine detente and a more peaceful world.

In recent months we have seen the development by the Soviet Union of a significant number of new weapon systems incorporating an impressive range of new and costly technology. Not only have the Soviets achieved a genuine MIRV capability, but they have done so by developing two quite distinct MIRV technologies.

They have tested a whole new generation of intercontinental ballistic missiles, land and sea based, incorporating new technologies as well as new launch techniques. They have developed a mobile, land-based ICBM.

They have moved to increase by a very substantial factor the throw weight of their missile forces despite the fact that they already enjoy a threefold advantage in this area. These developments, all of which have come to light since the SALT I interim agreement which was supposed to limit offensive weapons, have individually and in combination, added significantly to the offensive potential of the Soviet missile forces.

In assessing the significance of these developments, all of which are consistent with the often ambiguous terms of the SALT I interim agreement, it is necessary to digress for a moment to consider the rationale by which the interim agreement was defended.

The numerical disadvantage into which the United States was frozen by the SALT I interim agreement was held by some to be effectively offset by our technological superiority. The most obvious American technological advantage—obvious in part because

of the frequency with which Dr. Kissinger reiterated it—lay in the fact that we had achieved a MIRV capability and the Soviet Union had not.

Today our monopoly in MIRV technology has vanished like last year's snow and the lead in this area that we still possess by virtue of our earlier development of MIRV's can be expected to diminish rapidly as time goes on. This is neither novel nor surprising. In the long run—made longer if we find ourselves forced into a technological arms race and shorter if we do not—technology tends to even out.

That is the history of technology; and it is, in particular, the history of military technology. Given the numbers and throw weights agreed to in the SALT I interim agreement, under which the Soviets enjoy a protected advantage, technological equality will mean Soviet superiority in strategic weapons.

In the final analysis, an arms control agreement will not be stable if it freezes for one side an advantage in quantity while the other has to rely on an edge in quality that it cannot maintain. In the interim agreement we agreed to inferior numbers but the Soviets did not agree to inferior technology. We should never have presumed—I, for one, did not—that they would fail to seek the combination of superior numbers and comparable technology that add up to overall superiority; and this is precisely the direction that they have chosen.

In the current SALT II negotiations the Soviets are seeking to consolidate the advantage they obtained in the interim agreement while pressing for equality in technology. Again and again when the interim agreement was before the Senate I warned that this would be the Soviet strategy at SALT II. My amendment to the authorization for the interim agreement placed the Congress and the Administration on record on this issue by insisting that the interim agreement was not an acceptable basis for a SALT II treaty.

Now, with negotiations underway, we find that, just as expected, the Soviets have actually hardened their position. Far from viewing SALT II as an occasion to search for the sort of stable strategic balance that can result only from equality, they are insisting on a SALT II arrangement that would widen and deepen their strategic margin still further.

The response of the Administration to this situation has been disappointing in the extreme. For rather than concentrating on the design and presentation of an arms control proposal that could form the basis for a long-term stabilization of the strategic balance, the Administration has concentrated on quick-fix, short term proposals that can be readied in time for the forthcoming June summit meeting in Moscow.

In their desire to preserve the impression of momentum in the SALT negotiations, the Administration has abandoned its previous conviction that the essential purpose of a follow-on agreement should be to rectify the imbalance of SALT I. In their haste to meet an arbitrary and politically expedient self-imposed June deadline, the Administration has now begun to entertain Soviet proposals which are inimical to the national security of the United States and to the prospects for a SALT II treaty based on U.S.-Soviet equality.

Kept on such a course, SALT II is doomed to fail in the supreme mission of reducing the risk of mutual destruction. Indeed, instead of putting a damper on the arms race, such a failure would add fuel to the fire.

Given this situation, I am persuaded the time is ripe for the United States to put forward a bold and imaginative proposal for serious disarmament—a proposal that will test uncertain Soviet intentions by inviting them to join with us in concluding a far-

reaching agreement to bring about a measure of stability in the nuclear balance at sharply reduced levels of strategic forces.

Instead of arms limitation agreements that do not limit, it is time for serious arms reductions by both sides—a stabilizing disarmament.

In outlining my proposal it is useful to begin by recalling the numbers agreed to under the terms of the SALT I interim agreement, according to which the United States may have no more than 1,054 intercontinental ballistic missiles. This force consists principally of Minuteman missiles that are termed "light" (in contrast to "heavy") under the definitions worked out in conjunction with the interim agreement. For their part, the Soviets are permitted 1,618 intercontinental ballistic missiles of which approximately 1,300 are of the "light" variety.

The other 300 Soviet ICBMs are "heavy"—so heavy, in fact, that these 300 alone carry as much "throw weight" as the entire permitted U.S. force of 1,000 Minuteman missiles. With respect to the Soviet missile force the terms "light" and "heavy" are misleading because the missile that the Soviets apparently intend to deploy as a substitute in the "light" category for the missiles in that category at the time of the interim agreement are several times more powerful, several times "heavier" than our comparable systems.

At sea the interim agreement provides that the United States may have up to 44 missile-firing nuclear submarines containing 710 launch tubes. The Soviets are permitted up to 62 comparable submarines, with 950 launch tubes, in addition to a number of older type submarines. The Soviets are now engaged in building up to these levels.

I believe that strategic forces on both sides are larger than they need to be, provided that we can negotiate with the Soviets toward a common ceiling at a sharply lower level.

Therefore I propose that we invite the Soviets to consider a SALT II agreement in which each side would be limited to 800 ICBMs and to no more than 560 submarine-launched missiles, equivalent to 35 missile-firing submarines of the Poseidon type. Long range strategic bombers, which were not included under the interim agreement, would also be limited to 400 on each side. Because the throw weight of the Soviet missile force is so much greater than that of our own, the two SALT delegations would be instructed to negotiate a formula for varying these basic numbers so as to bring the throw weight of the two intercontinental strategic forces into approximate equality.

The numbers resulting from the negotiating process need not be precisely the numbers outlined here, although I believe that significant variation from these numbers, if essential to successful negotiation, ought to move in the direction of further reductions rather than upward adjustments.

Because the strategic forces of the countries are structured differently at present and because we are always searching for ways in which to reduce the potential vulnerability of our deterrent, the treaty need not follow the precise numbers for each type of weapon system I have suggested—so long as the aggregate total of intercontinental strategic launchers was 1,760 or less. Reductions to a level of equality would be carried out, in phases, over a period of time to be negotiated.

A treaty reflecting the essential features that I have outlined here would represent a real and significant step in the direction of stabilizing disarmament. It would put to rest many of the misgivings that we now have that the Soviets are seeking to attain strategic superiority by consolidating their advantage in SALT I. It would permit both sides to shift their resources from the building up of nuclear arsenals to the building up of their economies.

The Soviet Union has turned to the United

States for economic assistance, for our capital, our agricultural produce and our advanced technology. So long as the Soviets support the greatly exaggerated military sector of their economy at anything approaching current levels, an American program of subsidized economic transactions and the transfer of sophisticated technology, whatever its intended purpose, will inevitably amount to aid to the Russian army, naval and air forces.

At a time when the Soviet economy is in great difficulty we ought to be able to persuade them that a reordering of their priorities away from the military sector is the best way to achieve economic well-being. Adoption of my proposal could be an important step along a path that could lead eventually to billions of dollars in savings on strategic weapons systems.

It would enable us both to reorder our priorities.

If agreed to, it would mark a turning point in U.S.-Soviet relations of historic proportions. It would carry us to the brink of peace.

Such an accord could transform the atmosphere of mistrust and apprehension that has clouded the horizon of East-West relations since the end of World War II. It would add immeasurably to the confidence of both our peoples, indeed, of all mankind, that the grim prospect of thermonuclear war can be set aside and our energies devoted to purposes more constructive and more enduring than the amassing of the weapons of war. It would be, if ever there was one, a genuine conceptual breakthrough.

In the new and more hopeful world that would result, we could look forward to a broadening of the foundation of mutual accommodation, a deepening of the spirit of cooperation in trade and commerce, science and technology and the arts, and in the freer movement of people and ideas.

This is a program for the beginning of a more peaceful world. It is worthy of our best efforts. And I am committed to do whatever I can to bring it about.

I am under no illusion about the difficulty of negotiating an arms reduction agreement along the lines outlined here. It will take time and hard bargaining. The view of some in the Administration that force reductions are not negotiable is premature; and there are many who do not share this judgment. After all, it was Henry Kissinger himself, who warned—in his book "The Necessity for Choice"—that to reject sound proposals because they appeared to be non-negotiable was to acquiesce in negotiating on Soviet terms.

Some weeks ago I urged the President to consider the program that I have outlined here tonight. The response has not been encouraging. The refusal of the Administration to consider seriously a program for Soviet-American force reductions is as disappointing as the tendency to seek a quick cosmetic agreement in June is dangerous.

There is no critical point for negotiations that will be passed if June comes and goes without a follow-on SALT arrangement. There is nothing unique about the month of June that would justify an extension of the SALT I interim agreement and thereby legitimize its terms beyond 1977 and prejudice the prospects for a meaningful and stabilizing SALT II treaty.

I am not content to let the matter rest upon the complex and multi-purpose judgments of an embattled White House, or with a Department of State whose passion for momentum is sometimes indifferent to the direction in which it is headed. I have today requested, as Chairman of the Arms Control Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, that the Secretary of Defense undertake an immediate and thorough assessment of my arms reduction proposal for transmission to the Subcommittee.

Adoption of this proposal would mark a radical departure from the tentative and often marginal approach to arms control that we have followed in SALT. Reductions on the scale I am proposing will encounter opposition, not least of all from those in the military services whose training, experience and orientation are likely to militate against strategic force reductions in general, and extensive reductions in particular. While it would be imprudent to discard the professional judgment of the military and irresponsible to ignore their advice, I believe that we must not allow their skepticism to stand in the way of a proposal which will enhance our security.

I am confident that American military planners can be persuaded of the advantages of bilateral cutbacks in strategic weapons and that they too, in the final analysis, reflect the hopes we all share for a more stable strategic balance and a more peaceful world. I would hope that the Soviet military, which has been unresponsive to proposals such as this in the past, would give careful consideration to the promise of a better life for the Soviet people, who could be freed from part of the enormous burden of the arms they now bear. Here the job of persuasion must fall to the Politburo, and to them I am simply saying: Let us break with the troubled past and seek a more fruitful and secure future for both our peoples.

AVERELL HARRIMAN

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, as Gov. Averell Harriman quite appropriately receives numerous tributes these days on his celebration of 90 vigorous and illustrious years, I was especially struck by Philip Geyelin's column in the Washington Post of November 14.

Respected journalist Phil Geyelin has concisely captured several Averell Harriman traits that are central to the significant service Averell Harriman has given his country.

First, as a man of considerable private fortune and active clout in the business world, he did not have to undertake—or stick to—a second career of public service at all. That he did it, and stuck with it, marks Averell Harriman as the very personification of the most able of individual Americans' commitment to the common welfare that is fundamental to the healthy functioning of our democracy.

Second, he kept his eye resolutely on the object of the exercise—the national security and the national welfare.

It was not beneath Governor Harriman's dignity to take a position at the Department of State in the 1960's less high ranking than the one he had previously held. The sole criterion for him was that there was an important job to be done that he was well qualified to do. Not for Averell Harriman are the ego trips so common to the official Washington scene, all too often to the detriment of our Government's policies and reputation.

Finally, and most important of all, in his half century of public service Averell Harriman has amassed an unparalleled depth of experience with key international issues and actors.

When I met with Soviet leaders in the Kremlin a year ago, I was facing in President Brezhnev a man who had already

led his country for 16 years. Foreign Minister Gromyko has been in that position for 24 years. Defense Minister Ustinov has had similar defense industry responsibilities since 1941. They were facing their fourth U.S. administration in 6 years. Dealing with, negotiating with, nations as powerful and dedicated to their own self-interest as the Soviet Union is tough, serious business. It is highly desirable that we have available public servants who have been on the scene long enough to know how to represent the United States effectively in such situations.

In Averell Harriman, we have been so blessed. And he, in turn, has been blessed to have by his side his devoted, beautiful, and talented wife, Pamela, and the devoted support and undying admiration of their host of friends.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of the Phil Geyelin's November 14 Washington Post column.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AVERELL HARRIMAN: A GIANT
(By Philip Geyelin)

It was August 13, 1950. W. Averell Harriman was returning home from one more delicate mission—as President Truman's emissary to General Douglas MacArthur. He was about to take up another dicey piece of business as Truman's foreign policy coordinator.

Reporting in a late evening "newsmakers" broadcast, Walter Cronkite had this to say of the former almost-everything in American politics and diplomacy whose 90th birthday tomorrow was dedicated this week, at a fundraising dinner, to the fortunes (material as well as political) of his beloved Democratic Party:

"Harriman could have been a playboy. He was born with a \$70,000,000 silver spoon in his mouth . . . went to Groton and Yale . . . [then] into banking, became an eight-goal polo player, even developed a sort of upper-class stoop, a slight bow to boredom. But this millionaire was made of considerably sterner stuff. . . . Today Harriman seems to be a man devoted solely to selfless service to his country."

"Selfless service"—it sounds smarmy, unless you happen to be fed up to here with the rancid condition of American statescraft as it comes across these days: the obsession with "turf"; the "guerrilla warfare"; the who's-up-who's-down, who's-on-the-skids speculations of breathless analysts. Against that backdrop, a review of the record of Averell Harriman shines bright as a timely reminder to today's pushers and shovers of the purposes they are supposed to be serving—of what public service, at its best, is all about.

What it was all about, in Averell Harriman's case, was almost a half-century of reflexive, fire-horse pawing and champing at the fire bell's first ring. When Cronkite spoke of a "tall, stooped, unsmiling man who wearily climbed down from the big Constellation at Washington's National Airport," Harriman was 59 at that time and "wearily" was apparently the operative word. The way people talked about him 31 years ago made Harriman sound sometimes like a prime candidate for early retirement.

New York Times columnist C. L. Sulzberger, in an album of memoirs entitled "A Long Row of Candles," offered these snapshots of that period: "When Averell came in, he looked ghastly. He is visibly overtired and

thin . . . [and on another occasion] He looks tired and worn . . . [and on another] He really looked bushed . . . [and again] He looked poorly and has a tic in his eye . . . [and in 1951] Last week he worked straight through from 8 a.m. until 7 a.m. the following morning. That's too much for a man of sixty."

As it turned out, it wasn't. He had already served two presidents over 17 years: Franklin D. Roosevelt, as New Deal manager, lend-lease coordinator in London, wartime ambassador in Moscow; and Harry Truman as promotor and roving ambassador for the Marshall Plan. Still ahead was a mind-boggling succession of jobs: ambassador to London, secretary of commerce, nuclear test ban negotiator, undersecretary of state, Vietnam peace negotiator, and a half-dozen special presidential missions—not to mention governor of New York.

He voted for Al Smith in 1928 and became a Democrat for life because he was "very disturbed by the fallacies of the Republican Party, both domestic and foreign," he explained in a long conversation the other day. "I am just about always disturbed about something—you have to be."

He says he "can't get as excited about some things as I used to when I could put on a hat and do something about it." But when I called on him, he was hunched up, inches away from his television set. Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin was holding forth on ABC's "Issues and Answers," and if Harriman wasn't excited, his muttering suggested that he was, let's say, disturbed.

He was also philosophical. "Every situation always looks the worst it's ever been," he replied, when asked about the current international scene. "But these questions get solved because they have to be solved."

Does the man who dealt with Roosevelt and Churchill and Stalin subscribe to the theory that these men were giants—and that there are no giants on the contemporary stage? "History makes them giants, because what they do becomes important," is his answer. "But they are not giants when they do it—there will always be somebody around to do what's needed."

Without vanity but by way of illustration, he recalls that "everybody thought I was crazy" to accept a comedown from undersecretary of state to assistant secretary in the 1960s. "But it didn't bother me, because I knew I had a job to do. When something needed doing, I usually started to do something about it." He doesn't think that's unique—"there are many Americans who can do something about these things."

He's probably right. But there are not many—or at least not all that many now in action—who fit the test of selfless service set down by George Kennan, Harriman's No. 2 man in Moscow in the war years. In his "Memoirs" in 1967, Kennan wrote of Harriman:

"No diplomatist ever executed more punctiliously [his] instructions. . . . None—be it said to his eternal credit—was ever less inclined to distort the record however imperceptibly, in order to show himself and his performance off to good advantage. . . . The United States has never had a more faithful public servant."

DIANE DAVIES HARDIN

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, at one time or another, we all come to realize how very much our lives have been enriched and made worthwhile because of the way we have been touched by a close friend. My own life has been so affected by a number of good friends, one of whom is Dave Hardin of Wilmette, Ill. He is an

ordained minister, business leader, and chairman of Market Facts, Inc. of Chicago.

Through the years, I have not only been privileged to know him as a friend, but I know what a devoted husband and father he has been.

Dave recently lost his wife Diane. At the funeral services in early September, he gave the eulogy himself. I wish to share it with my colleagues so that they might also share in the tragedies and joys of the bond between Dave and Diane and in the wonderful relationship Diane had with her beloved husband, wonderful children, and the world around her.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the eulogy to Diane Davies Hardin.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIANE DAVIES HARDIN

(December 20, 1931–August 31, 1981)

For the past few years, it became fairly clear that I was likely to outlive Diane. Naturally, as we tend to do, I thought often about what her family and friends should know about her and what I would like to say about her. I felt several compelling reasons for wanting to say something.

First, I had a sense of injustice about her life and wanted to be sure that others shared it. Second, I had a strong need for people to admire Diane, because I felt she had done so much with such a poor start and not enough caring in her life. So, I waited and then on Monday night, Diane quietly slept her way into the Lord's hands.

In the past few years as her faith has grown more positive, so did her thoughts and her words. Her last word on Monday night, in response to my question about whether she was warm enough, was "Absolutely". Like all marriages, one of us was never warm enough, and she was that person in our marriage. About an hour later, she said "yes" to God and off she went.

When I sat down last night to organize the thoughts that I have had for several years about her unfortunate scenario, the words simply wouldn't come. Finally, it came to me that I was dead wrong about why I wanted to say something. Her life was not an unfortunate one at all. It was a challenging and all inspiring adventure. Diane had been on a journey for her Lord. She had had an assignment, she had finished it and she had gone home. And, I hope she is enjoying what we are saying here today.

She certainly had a difficult and a hard life—separated from her father at the age of four, a victim of too many divorces, and too many homes, and too many schools, and not enough caring—eleven schools in twelve years, and no one caring to get her to college. A gentle, but very weak mother who sold everything in their house but Diane's bed and bureau to cover an alcoholism problem when Diane was eleven years old.

What was the real result for Diane? It was to become a person who could listen, who could empathize, who could understand the hurt and loneliness of others.

Then fourteen years ago she discovered she had multiple sclerosis and her world gradually collapsed. Most of you know the progression—the cane, the walker, the wheelchair, the terrible fatigue, the humiliating incontinence, the blindness and finally the inability to speak. Where did it lead? It led us to a lot of places. It led to a service on a Sunday morning in March, ten years ago, at a CLC meeting where Ben Johnson said, "If you want Jesus Christ to take over your life, just stand up where you are". Diane mumbled, "Why am I fighting the Lord any

longer? With tears in her eyes, she stood up and committed herself to the Lord for good. And she took me with her—it took me a little longer, but she took me with her. And, I think she nudged a few of the rest of us on the way.

That journey led us to the Christian healing services of Katherine Kuhlman, truly a saint, a great servant of God. A spiritual healing occurred, as we saw God at work in an unquestionable, unbelievable fashion.

One of the songs we are going to sing today was Diane's great favorite (we always sang it there): "How Great Thou Art".

It led her to a life of constant time alone with God, unable to read or watch television, she chose to listen mostly to the Moody Bible radio station. She once told me, "You know, I know so much now about God and the Bible, and I don't think anyone knows that".

Her sense of humor never left her. While she knew she was on a journey for God, it wasn't her choice of routes—it never is—and she once said, "I know the Lord loves me, but I really think some dumb angel has misplaced my file." Or, one night, when I came home she said, "What did it look like", and I said "What did what look like?" She said, "The truck that hit me".

Just two weeks ago today we were in Boston on vacation. Someone had provided us with a boat, and we were going out into the Boston Harbor. When we took the wheelchair down to the dock, and lifted her over the railing, her shoes fell off. I was always letting her shoes fall off.

The shoe fell into the water between the dock and the boat. It was the only pair of shoes we had with us. We eventually got it out, but when the captain was trying to fish it out, she mumbled to me, "It's okay, I don't use it much".

Her life became almost cloistered. She knew what to do with it most of the time. She wouldn't watch soap operas because she thought they were addictive and not very meaningful for where she was. Instead she prayed, and she pondered. And, as a result, I honestly think Diane became reconciled to the whole world. Even to the point of reviewing all of her relationships and writing her mother-in-law to ask forgiveness for not having always loved her enough.

She sensed problems for her friends and she prayed for them. Once she prayed for some carpeting to be delivered at a friend's home on time; and I said, "That's an interesting prayer." Her response was, "Their marriage needs that carpeting to be delivered on time". And I'm sure it did.

She loved you all. I think her attitude was personified by the way she responded to people who would show her snapshots or pictures of their child or their grandchild. They would hand them to her, she would look at them and say, "How lovely" or "how cute". And, a good share of the time she was holding them upside down.

She felt so lucky to have Nancy and Jan and Amy. She cried with joy when she first saw Amy in the hospital, because as she said, "You know I wouldn't know how to raise a boy".

Last night I asked the girls and a couple of her friends for some words to describe her. I heard words like: "gentle", "serene", "accepting", "unselfish", "loving without judgment", "caring, courageous and uncomplaining".

Now, lest you begin to feel I have kind of lost touch with reality, let me tell you there was a lot of anger and there was a lot of tears, but that's part of the process of our journey—each of our journeys. If there is one meaningful thing that Diane would like to see come of this memorial service, it would be to see us all do a little more caring—see us all take a step or two that we might not otherwise take, in memory of her, to care for

someone—to make a call or see someone—to forgive someone that we might not otherwise forgive for something.

What that would really be if we did it—what an event it would be for her and for our Lord. To close, I just want to say that Diane's life was not deprived. She was just on a journey for the Lord—a powerful journey for me—a great one for our girls, our families, and our friends. We love you all for coming.

Jesus said in Matthew, "Come unto me all ye who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest". Diane is resting now.

PRESIDENT CARTER'S SUCCESS IN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, last week the Boston Globe featured a very thoughtful piece by columnist William V. Shannon on the achievements of former President Jimmy Carter in the area of foreign affairs. Mr. Shannon cites 10 important successes including the Camp David agreement, the negotiation of SALT II, and normalization of relations with China to support his argument that President Carter has an impressive record as a "peacemaker and a peacekeeper." He suggests that history will prove Jimmy Carter to be one of America's better Presidents. I readily agree.

In his 4 years as President, Jimmy Carter approached some of the most complex problems in foreign policy with courage, persistence, and determination to find solutions that would promote peace, security and the dignity of the individual. His successes should be recognized and applauded. I hope that in time President Carter will receive the credit which he so justly deserves for making important contributions to international peace and stability.

Mr. President, I highly recommend Mr. Shannon's column to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that the full text of his column be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCORE 10 FOR CARTER

(By William V. Shannon)

One year ago today, Jimmy Carter lost the White House to Ronald Reagan. In my view, it was a serious misjudgment by the American people. They substituted a talker for a doer, a showhorse for a workhorse.

When historians begin to arrive at a consensus, they will rank Carter as one of our better Presidents. Since I spent all but the first few months of Carter's term serving abroad as one of his ambassadors, I am not a wholly disinterested witness. I am also more familiar with his record in foreign affairs than in domestic policy. On that foreign record alone, however, he has at least 10 achievements that will make his historical reputation secure.

Number one: He negotiated the Camp David agreement. I can think of no other President who mastered the intricacies of a complex major dispute as Carter mastered the Israel-Egypt dispute and who played so crucial a personal role in moving that dispute from stalemate to solution. Begin and Sadat shared the Nobel Peace Prize but both would probably have agreed that Carter was the man who deserved it.

Number two: He initiated the Panama Canal treaties and shepherded them to ratification. The United States still has serious problems in Central America, but think how much worse they would be if the canal were still a festering issue and guerrilla warfare

against our troops in the Canal Zone were a real or potential danger. There was no natural constituency favoring the treaties. Insofar as there was any public interest, it was hostile. In achieving ratification, Carter carried off a brilliant tour de force of political initiative and creativity.

Number three: Carter made possible the peaceful transition from white-controlled Rhodesia to black-controlled Zimbabwe. There was strong pressure from the American business community in 1979 to recognize the "internal settlement" of Ian Smith and Bishop Muzorewa. Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) rounded up 39 senators in support of a resolution to have the United States drop its support for UN sanctions against Rhodesia. If Carter had caved in to this pressure, Smith and Muzorewa would never have gone to the London conference that produced last year's settlement. That is why Prime Minister Mugabe of Zimbabwe virtually endorsed Carter for re-election when he visited the White House in September 1980.

Number four: Carter extended full diplomatic recognition to Mainland China, finishing what Nixon began. Carter, who was trying to put our relations with every Communist country on a realistic basis, would have renewed relations with Cuba and Vietnam if either of those countries had been willing to meet him half-way.

Number five: Working through the canny politicking of Robert Strauss abroad and on Capitol Hill, the Carter Administration concluded the multilateral trade agreement and had it approved by Congress. This was the most important victory for liberalized trade since the Kennedy Administration.

Number six: When it was necessary to do so, Carter stood up to the Russians. After their invasion of Afghanistan, he had the courage in an election year to propose unpopular measures such as draft registration, a ban of US participation in the Olympics and a ban on further grain sales to the Soviets. Reagan criticized the first two and has now abandoned the third. Americans may think he is tougher than Carter, but does the Kremlin?

Number seven: Carter persuaded Greece to resume full military participation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and persuaded Congress to resume arms sales to Turkey.

Number eight: Carrying forward the bipartisan policy of previous administrations of wooing Eastern European countries to loosen their ties with the Soviet Union, Carter returned the crown of St. Stephen to Hungary. This symbol of Hungarian nationhood had been in US hands since 1945. Carter's return of the crown was of much more lasting significance in Eastern Europe than his vastly overcriticized delay in visiting Yugoslavia after Tito's death.

Number nine: He negotiated the second Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty. In the post-Afghanistan atmosphere, he had to postpone seeking ratification of SALT II. But if he had been re-elected along with a Democratic-controlled Senate, he would have sought and in all likelihood achieved its ratification this year. It is worth remembering that Carter was never defeated on a major foreign policy issue in Congress in four years.

Number ten: Carter stood up for human rights around the world. After the disgusting cynicism of Nixon and Kissinger, he restored America's good name.

As a peacemaker and a peacekeeper, Carter in four years compiled an exemplary record. He need not fear posterity's judgment.

THOMAS F. GILBANE'S MAGNIFICENT LEGACY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I would like to share with my colleagues the legacy

of a dear friend who has built towering buildings but whose compassion and friendship has eclipsed even the magnificence of his buildings.

I would add here that, just yesterday morning, I had the opportunity to participate in the ground breaking of one of his latest projects, the new Federal building in our capital city of Providence.

Thomas F. Gilbane, 70, died November 7 in Providence, R.I. Throughout his life, Tom used his many talents to enrich countless lives, particularly the lives of young Rhode Islanders.

A native of Providence, Tom was chairman and chief executive officer of the Gilbane Building Co., one of the largest construction firms in the United States.

Under his leadership, the company built or supervised the construction of some of the larger structures in the country—including the National Air and Space Museum here in Washington, D.C.

His company received the Build America Award—the highest honor conferred by the Associated General Contractors—for the National Air and Space Museum.

Although he left an outstanding and impressive physical legacy, Tom has left an even more outstanding spiritual legacy—one clearly built through his work with young Rhode Islanders and demonstrated by the enrichment of their lives.

Tom and his brother Bill were among the original board members of Big Brothers of Rhode Island, when it was first organized in 1952. He later served as director and clearly loved the work and the many young people it helped.

He joined the Boy Scouts in 1924 and became an Eagle Scout. He maintained his enthusiasm for scouting and his work earned many honors, including the Silver Buffalo Award—the highest honor the Boy Scouts can bestow for volunteer service to young people.

An outstanding athlete and college football coach, as well as an AAU shotput champion, Tom was a member of the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame, the Brown Athletic Hall of Fame, the Providence Gridiron Hall of Fame, and the Rhode Island Heritage Hall of Fame.

No recounting of his achievements, however, can do more than hint at the scope and talent of a unique man and his good works. Nor can a recounting capture the spirit and genuine warmth of this remarkable individual.

I grieve with his family but I am thankful that Tom's life has improved the lives of so many others. All of our lives are enriched for having known him and we will miss him.

Mr. President, I would like to share with my colleagues some newspaper accounts of his contributions to Rhode Island and the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence Journal, Nov. 9, 1981]
THOS. GILBANE DIES; BUILDER, CIVIC LEADER
PROVIDENCE.—Thomas F. Gilbane, 70, builder, civic leader and renowned Brown Univer-

sity athlete, died Saturday in Rhode Island Hospital of apparent heart failure, a day after he was admitted. He was the husband of Jean Ann (Murphy) Gilbane.

Mr. Gilbane was chairman and chief executive officer of the Gilbane Building Co., one of the largest construction firms in the United States.

Born in Providence, Nov. 4, 1911, he was a son of the late William Henry and Frances (Freeman) Gilbane. He lived at 151 Grotto Ave. and had a summer home, "Eastaway," in Narragansett.

Mr. Gilbane led a company that was founded in Providence in the 1870s as a one-man carpentry operation by his grandfather, William Gilbane. The company grew into a national concern that has such projects to its credit as the National Air and Space Museum in Washington and the facilities for the 1980 Winter Olympics at Lake Placid, N.Y.

The Gilbane family came to Rhode Island from Ireland during the potato famine of 1845, when William Gilbane was one year old. The company he founded as a young man soon rose to prominence and was selected as the builder for the original Rhode Island Hospital, the Museum of Natural History and the Casino in Roger Williams Park, Pendleton House (part of the Museum of Art at the Rhode Island School of Design), several substantial homes on the East Side of Providence and the original Hope, Technical and Classified High Schools.

Under Thomas Gilbane's leadership, the company built or supervised construction of some of the larger structures in the country, including in recent years three Miller Beer breweries and strategic petroleum reserve facilities in Texas and Louisiana that cost about \$350 million.

The company received the Build America Award for the National Air and Space Museum, the highest distinction conferred by the Associated General Contractors.

Mr. Gilbane, who became president-treasurer of the company in 1939, was in charge of its World War II construction projects, which included the Quonset Point Naval Air Station and housing at the Newport Naval Base.

The U.S. Navy awarded the company its traditional "E"—excellence—award for its performance during the war.

In 1975 Mr. Gilbane became chairman and chief executive officer of the company.

Recent construction projects in Providence by the Gilbane Building Co. include the Holiday Inn, the Regency apartment buildings, the Blue Cross-Blue Shield building, One Weybosset Hill, an office complex, and the Gilbane headquarters building on Cathedral Square.

A member of St. Sebastian's Church, Mr. Gilbane was named two months ago an associate chairman of the interfaith National Bible Week.

A former president of the Greater Providence Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Gilbane stressed the importance of good relations between management and labor as a necessity for economic growth. In 1958 he headed a labor-management committee seeking legislation to improve the business climate of Rhode Island.

"He was a progressive influence in the community and we're going to miss him greatly," said Edwin C. Brown, secretary-treasurer of the state AFL-CIO. "He made a great contribution to the community in the labor-management field and through a variety of organizations with which he was affiliated. His life was filled with good works."

One of Mr. Gilbane's favorite organizations was Big Brothers of Rhode Island, which he served variously as a director and in other capacities.

Robert F. Killian, executive director of the United Way agency, said, "Thomas Gilbane

was one of our original board members back in 1952 when we were organized. He remained a good friend right up to the end. Tom Gilbane was certainly one of the finest men I have ever known."

"We at Big Brothers always felt free to call upon him and his brother Bill and they never let us down. I think the important thing about Tom Gilbane was that he really believed in what he was doing, and was not just behaving the way he thought a person in his position was supposed to."

"There was that special personality thing about him, too. I didn't see him all that much, but I always felt when I was in his company as if I had known him all my life. Tom Gilbane was a great person. He just had it all."

A 1933 graduate of Brown University who majored in engineering and economics, Mr. Gilbane was a past president of the Brown Club of Rhode Island and a trustee emeritus of the university. He served on the school's Athletic Council and as director of the Brown Football Association in 1973-74.

Mr. Gilbane received an honorary degree from Brown in 1958.

He made his mark in football and track and became a member of Brown's Hall of Fame. He played center on the Brown football team for three years, graduating in 1933. The 1932 team was unbeaten and unscored on through seven games, but lost to Colgate on Thanksgiving Day. Mr. Gilbane's brother, William, was also a star of the team.

Mr. Gilbane held the interscholastic record in the shot put and discus throw when he graduated from Hope High School, and at Brown he became the national Amateur Athletic Union champion and a record holder in the shot put.

Mr. Gilbane served from 1936 to 1940 as coach of freshmen football at Brown, and in 1935 as head coach of varsity football at Westminster College in New Wilmington, Pa.

He had been a member of the Narragansett Council of the Boy Scouts of America since 1924 and had held several leadership posts in New England scouting. A former scoutmaster, he received the Silver Antelope Award in 1972 and served as chairman of the National Eagle Scout Association from 1974 to 1976. He received the Distinguished Eagle Pin in 1975.

Mr. Gilbane also served at various times as a director of the Providence Community Fund, a member of the advisory board of Salve Regina College and a director of Butler Hospital.

Among his other civic and social areas of interest were the Coast Guard Academy Foundation, the Industrial Foundation of Rhode Island, Providence Council of Knights of Columbus, Bishop Hendricks Council, Fourth Degree, Knights of Columbus, American Chapter of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta, Knights of the Holy Sepulchre, the National Football Foundation, the Emma Pendleton Bradley Hospital, the Sophia Little Home, Women and Infants Hospital, and the Rhode Island Society for Prevention of Blindness.

Mr. Gilbane also served at various times as chairman of the Harvard Parents Committee, president of the Rhode Island chapter of the Associated General Contractors of America, president of the Providence Gridiron Club, president of the Greater Providence Chamber of Commerce, a board member of the state affiliate of the American Heart Association and a board member and trustee of various business and financial institutions in the region.

Besides his wife, he leaves five sons, Thomas F. Gilbane of Shaker Heights, Ohio, Robert V. Gilbane of Rumford, Richard T. Gilbane of Houston, Tex., John D. Gilbane of Narragansett, and James M. Gilbane, a student at Harvard University; a daughter Jean M. Gilbane of New York City; a brother, William J. Gilbane of Providence, the president of Gilbane Building Co.; a sister, Vir-

ginia Choquette of White Plains, N.Y., and five grandchildren.

The funeral will be held tomorrow in the Cathedral of St. Peter & Paul with a Mass of Christian Burial at 10:30 a.m. Burial in Swan Point Cemetery will be private.

[From the Evening Bulletin, Nov. 10, 1981]

THOMAS F. GILBANE

He was offensive center and defensive line-backer on Brown's greatest football team, the 1932 Bruins that were undefeated until the final game of the season against Colgate.

After the season, which was his senior year, he was selected to play for the East in the annual Shrine Game at San Francisco. During the week of preparation for the game the athletes toured the Shrine Hospital for Crippled Children. It was an experience he never forgot. He has mentioned it many times through the years.

In all probability he would have maintained his interest in youth anyway, but that incident gave a spark to his later activities.

He joined the Boy Scouts in 1924, became an Eagle Scout, and retained his interest in them throughout his lifetime. He has served in many capacities in scouting hierarchy and has been honored with several awards, among them the Silver Antelope, the Distinguished Eagle Pin and finally the Silver Buffalo Award, highest honor the Scouts can bestow for volunteer service to young people.

He was director of Big Brothers of Rhode Island. Cy Killian, executive director of the organization said, "He was one of the original board members along with his brother Bill, and they never let us down."

Other columns of this newspaper have been devoted to his business and charitable activities, and his work as a Catholic layman, but this pertains to his sports interests and those of youth.

Tom was first president of the Providence Gridiron Club, past president of the Brown Club of Rhode Island, and trustee emeritus of his Alma Mater.

He coached football at Westminster College and at Brown, and besides his gridiron accomplishments he was AAU shotput champion, and his shotput record at Brown stood until broken by his nephew, Paul Choquette. He also managed to find summer jobs for Brown athletes in his construction company. He never failed to give a pat on the back or pass on a compliment.

He was a member of the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame, the Brown Athletic Hall of Fame, the Providence Gridiron Hall of Fame and the Rhode Island Heritage Hall of Fame.

He and Bill were as close as brothers could be. They played and worked together throughout their entire lifetime, and now there will be a great void in Bill's life.

Hundreds of us have lost a good and loyal friend, and the state has lost a most outstanding citizen.—Lanning.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

DEDUCTION FOR COST OF ADVERTISING PLACED IN A FOREIGN MARKET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 93

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

On September 9, 1980, President Carter sent a message to the Congress concerning the Canadian tax law which denies a deduction for Canadian income tax purposes for the cost of advertising placed with a foreign broadcast undertaking and directed primarily at the Canadian market. President Carter determined that this provision within Canadian law is an unreasonable practice which burdens U.S. commerce within the meaning of section 201(a)(2)(B) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2411(a)(2)(B)). President Carter further determined that the Canadian practice resulted in the loss of access by U.S. broadcasters to more than \$20 million in advertising revenues annually.

President Carter, under provisions of the Trade Act of 1974, proposed legislation which would amend the Internal Revenue Code to deny a deduction, otherwise allowable under the Code, for expenses of an advertisement placed with a foreign broadcast undertaking and directed primarily to a market in the United States. This restriction would apply only if a similar deduction is denied to advertisers in the country in which such station is located for the cost of advertising directed primarily to a market in that country when placed with a U.S. broadcast undertaking. It would, therefore, be applicable to Canada.

Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 requires that if the President determines that action by the United States is appropriate to respond to any act, policy, or practice of a foreign country that is unjustifiable, unreasonable or discriminatory and burdens or restricts United States commerce, he shall take all appropriate and feasible action within his power to obtain the elimination of such act, policy or practice. The intent of section 301 is to resolve disputes and thereby eliminate the unjustifiable, unreasonable or discriminatory trade practices which burden or restrict United States commerce. The Canadian tax law is the subject of one such dispute. Notwithstanding a good faith effort on the part of the United States Trade Representative to resolve the dispute and have the offending practice eliminated, this dispute has not been resolved. Therefore, I am acting under the authority of section 301 to recommend legislation similar to the amendment proposed by President Carter. This amendment to the Internal Revenue Code would mirror the Canadian law as it applies to broadcast undertakings, i.e., it would deny a tax deduction for expenses of advertisements placed with a foreign broadcast undertaking and directed primarily to a market in the U.S. This restriction would apply only if the laws of the country in which such foreign broadcast undertaking is located deny a similar deduction to advertisers in that country. Thus, the legislation will estab-

lish a disincentive to the transfer of U.S. advertising revenues to foreign broadcast undertakings only if the laws of the country in which such broadcast undertakings are located create a similar disincentive vis-a-vis U.S. broadcast undertakings. Thus, if Canada should repeal its law, the amendment will cease to apply to Canada. It would be effective with respect to deductions attributable to transactions entered into on or after the date of introduction of this bill.

At this time, the mirror image legislation is an appropriate response to the Canadian practice. The intent of such legislation is not to erect new barriers to trade, but rather to encourage the Canadians to eliminate their unreasonable and restrictive practice. I recognize, however, that this amendment by itself may not cause the Canadians to resolve this dispute. Therefore, I note that I retain the right to take further action, if appropriate, to obtain the elimination of the practice on my own motion under the authority of section 301(c)(1). Hopefully, this will not be necessary.

This legislative proposal is being submitted at this time because I believe it is imperative that the Government of Canada be made to realize the importance the U.S. Government attaches to the resolution of this issue. I urge its early passage.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 17, 1981.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:21 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 841. An act to name the United States Post Office Building in Portsmouth, Ohio, the "William H. Harsha United States Post Office Building";

H.R. 1710. An act to authorize the use of the frank for official mail sent by the Law Revision Counsel of the House of Representatives;

H.R. 2494. An act to designate the John Archibald Campbell United States Courthouse;

H.R. 4506. An act to name the lock and dam authorized to replace locks and dam 26, Mississippi River, Alton, Illinois, as "Melvin Price Lock and Dam"; and

H.R. 4569. An act to designate the United States Post Office Building in Hartford, Connecticut, as the "William R. Cotter Federal Building".

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were read twice by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 841. An act to name the U.S. Post Office Building in Portsmouth, Ohio, the "William H. Harsha United States Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1710. An act to authorize the use of the frank for official mail sent by the Law Revision Counsel of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2494. An act to designate the John Archibald Campbell United States Courthouse; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 4506. An act to name the lock and

dam authorized to replace locks and dam 26, Mississippi River, Alton, Ill., as "Melvin Price Lock and Dam"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 4569. An act to designate the U.S. Post Office Building in Hartford, Conn., as the "William R. Cotter Federal Building"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-2227. A communication from the Clerk of the United States Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the Court's judgment in the case of the Greek Nation of Oklahoma v. the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-2228. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Research, Development, and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the study with respect to converting the transient aircraft maintenance function at Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, and the decision that performance under contract is the most cost-effective method of accomplishment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2229. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a status report on projects assisted under Section 608 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2230. A communication from the Executive Director of the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities and fiscal status of the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2231. A communication from the Chairman of the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 1983 budget request of the Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2232. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Energy (Conservation and Renewable Energy), transmitting, pursuant to law, the comprehensive program management plan for the Federal Wind Energy Systems Program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2233. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Congressional Relations), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to implement the Inter-American Convention on International Commercial Arbitration; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2234. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting, pursuant to law, the text of an agreement between the United States and Taiwan relating to the protection of information; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2235. A communication from the Acting Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States in the sixty day period prior to November 10, 1981; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2236. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Administration), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a new Privacy Act system of records; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2237. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority Retirement Sys-

tem, transmitting, pursuant to law, statements, tables, and general information on the TVA retirement plan; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2238. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation adopted by the Council on October 27, 1981; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2239. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the fiscal year 1982 request of the Commission for a supplemental appropriation; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-607. A resolution adopted by the Citizens' Party of Connecticut, opposing the decontrol of natural gas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM-608. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

"RESOLUTION No. 170

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

"Whereas, for several years, Guam has been attempting to achieve economic self-sufficiency. With relief from certain federal regulations not applicable to its marketplace, Guam could become self-sufficient. These laws were imposed on Guam during the colonial days when Washington lobbyists were concerned about a possible massive influx of inexpensive foreign-made products into the American marketplace. Those laws, of course, became outdated in 1946 when the Philippines received its independence. Unfortunately, Guam has never been able to gain relief from these laws; and

"Whereas, recent changes in federal tax and budget policies have brought the issue of Guam's economy to a head. For years, Guam's representatives have attempted to convince Washington that with certain amendments to Guam's Organic Act and other federal laws, Guam could become economically self-sufficient. Therefore, Guam would be far less dependent on federal financial assistance at a considerable savings to the American taxpayer; and

"Whereas, the territory has commissioned several economic studies conducted by prestigious organizations. Very recently, Professor Arthur B. Laffer submitted the results of an in-depth study on Guam's economic growth potential and negative results of continuing the application of certain federal laws to Guam. These studies confirm Guam's position that its real economic problems can only be resolved by federal action aimed at eliminating the federal legal obstacles now retarding Guam's attempts at achieving economic self-sufficiency. The gravity of the problem now facing Guam compels immediate action to amend restraining federal laws; and

"Whereas, the history of Guam's economy has been punctuated by a history of federal administration at times restrictive in its impact to the territory. In the opinion of many economists, Guam's development often times was severely retarded by certain federal laws or policies made applicable to this territory. From 1898 to 1950, Guam was a military reservation administered by the U.S. Navy. From 1951 to 1962, federal security clearances were imposed on travelers, businessmen and even residents of Guam seeking to return to their homeland. After 1962, that security clearance requirement was lifted, and for the first time, market incentives and investment incentives began to attract entrepreneurs destined to become

pioneers of Guam's private sector. It was only after the first election of our Governor in 1970 that the island of Guam started on the road to normal civilian operation. The local government has been struggling to achieve increased authority over Guam's internal affairs ever since; and

"Whereas, a private economic base has been established on Guam, now it only needs nourishment to flourish. That nourishment is, in part, the freedom to grow without undue restraints or confinements; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Sixteenth Guam Legislature requests the assistance of the President in establishing an Economic Advisory Commission for Guam to operate in association with the White House Domestic Council and the Council of Economic Advisers. The object of the Commission would be not only to examine specific federal laws now restraining Guam's economy but also to propose model legislation or policies to effectively deal with establishing a self-sufficient Guam; and be it further

"Resolved, That a Presidential Advisory Commission to study initiatives which could be taken to permit growth in Guam's economy—they could recommend specific federal deregulatory initiatives which could make Guam a productive American community and an example to the world instead of a ward of the State . . . and the effect would be a rapid and dynamic success; and be it further

"Resolved, That this plea comes at a time when Guam must vigorously pursue all policies which will allow Guam to stand on its own two feet and successfully survive the adversity associated with the dramatic transition current policies have forced upon Guam; and be it further

"Resolved, That the economic studies mentioned above provide specific recommendations which the Presidential Economic Advisory Commission on Guam should consider whether:

"1. Guam should be exempted from quotas established under Headnote 3(a) of the U.S. Tariff Schedules. Guam must become truly a free port wherein anything that is the manufacture of or the growth of this island leaves it duty free and enters any other American port duty free without regard to quotas established under Headnote 3(a).

"2. Certain provisions of the Jones Act should be amended so as to permit the use of foreign bottoms for fishing within Guam waters by American fishermen.

"3. Guam should be exempted from federal minimum wage laws and be allowed to control importation of alien labor at wage rates the local government deems fair and equitable.

"4. Guam should be permitted special treatment under the Immigration and Naturalization Act to permit local certification of immigrant workers and foreign investors; and

"5. The Internal Revenue Act should be amended to permit the government of Guam to adopt its own income tax incentives for investors and businesses; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Speaker certify to and the Legislative Secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America; to the Honorable George Bush, Vice-President of the United States of America; to the Honorable Strom Thurmond, President Pro-tem of the United States Senate; to the Honorable Thomas P. O'Neill, Speaker of the House of Representatives, United States Congress; to Senator Lowell P. Weicker; to Professor Arthur B. Laffer; to the Secretary of the Interior; to Mr. Pedro San Juan, Director Designate, Office of Territories; to Congressman Antonio B. Won Pat; and to the Governor of Guam."

POM-609. A resolution adopted by the San Diego County Republican Party, supporting

legislation to make English the official language of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-610. A petition from a citizen of Alma, Georgia, relative to union violence in America; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

POM-611. A petition from a citizen of Houston, Tex., relative to union violence in America; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

POM-612. A petition from a citizen of Orlando, Florida, relative to outlawing monopoly bargaining in the Federal service; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

POM-613. A resolution adopted by the Republican National Hispanic Assembly of Texas, urging the Reagan Administration to continue its efforts to bring more Hispanics into the Administration at high level positions; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 57. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of February 7 through 13, 1982, as "National Scleroderma Week".

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, and an amendment to the title:

S. Res. 98. A resolution to designate February of each year as "American History Month".

By Mr. HATFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1857. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 97-273).

By Mr. HATFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.J. Res. 357. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1982, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

Lawrence W. Pierce, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit;

Clarence A. Beam, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska;

John Bailey Jones, of South Dakota, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Dakota;

Emmett Ripley Cox, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Alabama;

Cynthia Holcomb Hall, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California;

Robert J. Wortham, of Texas, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas for the term of four years;

Alan H. Nevas, of Connecticut, to be United States Attorney for the District of Connecticut for the term of four years;

John W. Gill, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Tennessee for the term of four years;

Joseph P. Russoniello, of California, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of California for the term of four years;

Philip N. Hogan, of South Dakota, to be United States Attorney for the District of South Dakota for the term of four years;

J. Jerome Perkins, of Indiana, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Indiana for the term of four years;

Denny L. Sampson, of Nevada, to be United States Marshal for the District of Nevada for the term of four years;

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. DURENBERGER (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. HEINZ and Mr. DANFORTH):

S. 1854. A bill to make permanent the exclusion of gross income of national research service awards; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENTSEN (for himself and Mr. TOWER):

S. 1855. A bill to make section 457(e) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 inapplicable to certain State judicial plans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEINZ:

S. 1856. A bill for the relief of Francesco Bellizzi and Maria Bellizzi, husband and wife, and their children, Marco Bellizzi and Dina Bellizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATFIELD (from the Committee on Appropriations):

S. 1857. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. CANNON (for himself and Mr. LAXALT):

S. 1858. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California and to transfer certain other lands to the administration of the U.S. Forest Service; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURENBERGER (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. DANFORTH):

S. 1854. A bill to make permanent the exclusion from gross income of national research service awards; to the Committee on Finance.

NATIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE AWARDS

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, today I am introducing, along with Senators BAUCUS, HATCH, BRADLEY, HEINZ, and DANFORTH, legislation to bring a permanent solution to the issue of the tax status of awards granted by the Public Health Service for biomedical research training—national research service awards (NRSA's). In 1977 the Internal Revenue Service ruled that NRSA's were not scholarships because recipients must engage in health research or teaching or equivalent service for a period equal to the length of the award. Thus, NRSA's did not qualify under section 117 of the code exempting the entire amount of the scholarship for degree candidates and up to \$300 per month—\$3,600 per year—for a total of 3 years for nondegree candidates.

Each year since that time Congress has passed legislation to treat NRSA's as scholarships under section 117. The latest extension expires at the end of this year. By providing for a permanent inclusion of NRSA's under section 117, the Congress would relieve itself of the burden of periodic extension of the moratorium on full taxation of the awards.

Further, such an exemption would be in keeping with the intention of both the Senate and House authorizing committees.

The most recent expression of intent by the authorizing committees is found in the statement of managers in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981. After citing other expressions of intent over the years since the Internal Revenue Service first ruled NRSA's taxable, the managers stated:

National Research Service Awards are not made for the purpose of receiving services designated by the grantor. Rather, the payback requirement offers benefits to the Nation from the participation of NRSA recipients in the research enterprise. As the Committee does not believe that the payback requirement is a quid pro quo, the tax exemption should be applicable.

As a member of the committee with jurisdiction over the tax issue and as chairman of its Subcommittee on Health, I concur with my colleagues on the authorizing committees, NRSA's are the primary means of assuring an adequate manpower pool for our Nation's health research enterprise. Taxation of these awards would severely limit the effectiveness of this program in encouraging our country's most promising, aspirant scientists to direct their careers toward much-needed biomedical research. Further, these awards are the principal incentive offered prospective physician investigators to enter medical research and forgo the considerably greater financial rewards of private sector practice.

The awards are not large, and taxing them would certainly diminish their attractiveness. Degree candidates receive between \$7,040 and \$13,040 to cover tuition, fees, and living expenses. Postdoctoral trainees receive a larger sum—between \$13,380 and \$18,780, but these are people who could be receiving substantially more for other activities, and their exclusion is limited to \$3,600 per year.

It is clear that taxation of these awards is not in keeping with the intention of the original legislation, and that such taxation would create an economic disincentive to accepting national research service awards without any significant concomitant benefit to the U.S. Treasury. Consequently, I believe that the Nation's interests are served best by maintaining these awards as fellowships under the Tax Code.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1854

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (2) of section 161(b) of the Revenue Act of 1978 (relating to exclusion from gross income for national research service awards) is amended by striking out "during calendar years 1974 through 1980" and inserting in lieu thereof "after December 31, 1973".

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, my respected colleague from Minnesota, the chairman of the Finance Committee's Subcommittee on Health, Senator DAVID DURENBERGER, is today introducing legislation providing that national research

service awards (NRSA's), traditionally treated as scholarships or fellowship grants for tax purposes since their inception in 1974, be permanently given this tax status. As the ranking minority member of the Health Subcommittee, I am most pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill—one clearly deserving of bipartisan support.

The NRSA program, by assuring a highly qualified manpower pool for the Nation's biomedical research enterprise, has significantly contributed to scientific progress in the battle against disease and premature death. Taxation of the full amount of the tuition payments and stipends provided by this program would create a serious disincentive to the students and young scientific investigators training for careers in biomedical research with the assistance of NRSA's.

Since 1977, when the Internal Revenue Service ruled, in Revenue Ruling 77-319, that amounts received from the NRSA program must be included in gross taxable income, the erosion of the value of these Federal awards has been prevented by a series of congressional moratoriums on their full taxability. It is now clear that IRS has no intention of reversing its ruling, and it is thus time for the Congress to end its periodic enactment of these moratoriums by making the current tax treatment of NRSA's permanent tax policy. In doing so, the Congress would significantly enhance the incentive offered by NRSA's whose recipients have, for the past 4 years, not known from 1 year to the next whether their modest financial resources would be decreased through taxation.

The committee's responsible for authorizing the NRSA program, Labor and Human Resources in the Senate and Energy and Commerce in the House, have on several occasions emphatically stated that the IRS ruling is a misinterpretation of their intent in creating the award program. They have clearly indicated that any service "payback" required is not intended for the purpose of the grantor—the Federal Government—receiving services from the grantee as is implied by the IRS ruling that such payback or quid pro quo. Rather, as stated by the authorizing committees in the conference report on the budget reconciliation bill, "the payback requirement offers benefits to the Nation from the participation of NRSA recipients in the research enterprise."

The viability and purpose of Federal support for research training should not be allowed to be undermined by the erroneous interpretation of the law by the IRS. As a member of the Finance Committee which has jurisdiction over tax matters, I intend to lend Chairman DURENBERGER my full support in bringing this matter to a favorable close before the current moratorium on full taxation of NRSA's expires on December 31, 1981. ● Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator DURENBERGER in introducing a bill which makes permanent an existing tax exemption for income derived from national research service awards (NRSA's). The NRSA's provide support for pre- and post-doctoral students of the biomedical and behavioral sciences in areas of national

need and have undoubtedly contributed to the recent rapid advances in biomedical research as exemplified by the recombinant DNA technology. Indeed Congress has many times recognized the importance of the training program to the maintenance of the Nation's Biomedical and behavioral research efforts.

It should be recognized that although the NRSA's do contain pay-back clauses, their primary function is to train investigators for entry into areas of national need in the biomedical and behavioral sciences. The NRSA's are granted competitively and thus seek out the best available candidates. This insures the elements of scholarship so essential to our scientific enterprise.

Dr. Donald Fredrickson, former Director of the National Institutes of Health, and many others, have often discussed the difficulty in attracting talent to research fields. In particular the number of physicians entering research training has rapidly declined since the early 1970's. While there is no immediate cause for alarm concerning the future supply of scientific manpower overall, we must be aware of the trends and react appropriately. The stipends of the NRSA's have not kept pace with inflation and the prospect of taxation would further detract from the subsistence levels the NRSA's provide. A congressional failure to provide tax exemptions for NRSA recipients will result in a true disincentive for bright young students to enter research areas associated with our national needs.●

By Mr. BENTSEN (for himself and Mr. Tower):

S. 1855. A bill to make section 457(e) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 inapplicable to certain State judicial plans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEXAS JUDGES BILL

● Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation which would address a technical, unintended problem caused by section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. This legislation is in the nature of a technical correction to section 457, since it is fair to say that had Congress perceived this problem when first enacting section 457 in 1978, some effort would have been made to cover the situation that bill should remedy.

Section 457 was adopted to clarify the taxation of benefits under optional salary reduction arrangements sponsored by State and local governments. Congress wrote section 457 to the code to accomplish two things: First, to establish structural requirements which deferred compensation salary reduction plans would have to meet to earn favorable tax treatment; and second, in section 457(e) to specify the tax treatment of salary reduction planned benefits which failed to meet the structural requirements.

If a plan fails to satisfy the requirements of an eligible State deferred compensation plan, then compensation deferred under such plan is currently includable in a participant's income for the first taxable year in which there is no substantial risk of forfeiture—that is,

upon vesting. The Internal Revenue Service recognized at the time it promulgated the proposed section 457 regulation that there are State plans that are the regular retirement plan of the State but which do not qualify as eligible State-deferred compensation plans under the code. Thus, participants in these plans would appear to be subject to the severe tax treatment requiring the inclusion of all such deferred compensation taxable income immediately upon vesting.

Mr. President, this is a very harsh result and in some cases is one which probably goes well beyond what Congress was attempting to get at by the adoption of section 457. In fact, in the preamble to the proposed regulations the Internal Revenue Service acknowledged that it is unclear whether this result was intended. The reforms brought about by section 457 were an attempt to prevent situations where employees of State and local government defer recognition of income through optional deferred compensation agreements with their employers. The bill I am introducing today in no way weakens that reform. This legislation is narrowly drawn and provides no loophole for the kind of optional preferred compensation arrangements limited by the 1978 act.

The bill I am authorizing would add to the exceptions from section 457 State judicial plans that are the regular, exclusive, mandatory plan for service as an elected State judge. The bill would not allow additional, optional contributions by judges that would affect thecludable compensation.

Since I believe that this legislation is essentially a technical correction to the 1978 provision, and is in no way intended to carve out a "safe harbor" for the newly adopted plans, I have included a limitation in the bill that would apply the exception to only those plans continuously in existence since December 31, 1978, the point after which section 457 became effective. Further, in light of the technical correction nature of this legislation, the provisions of the bill are generally effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1978.●

By Mr. CANNON (for himself and Mr. LAXALT):

S. 1858. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California and to transfer certain other lands to the administration of the U.S. Forest Service; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

LEGISLATION RELATING TO CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce for myself and my distinguished colleague, Senator LAXALT, a bill to provide for the transfer, in trust, of certain portions of the Stewart Indian School complex in Nevada to the Washoe Tribe in Nevada and California. Involved in the transfer are some 2,890 acres.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs announced its decision early in 1980 to close the Stewart Indian School. The facility was closed in September of 1980. Subsequent to that action, the Washoe Tribe leased all lands associated with the Stew-

art School excluding the school grounds themselves. The purpose of the tribe was to increase its agriculture production capabilities. This agriculture pursuit will continue under the provisions of this bill. I emphasize that the lands involved in this bill are those associated with the Stewart School but do not include the school facility itself. The school facility is the subject of competing claims which have yet to be resolved.

The Stewart properties included in this bill lie within the recognized aboriginal lands inhabited by the Indians at the time of white entry and lend strength to the claim of the tribe to this legislative transfer. The Washoe number some 1,500 individuals of which some 500 live within three established colonies in western Nevada and one colony in northern California. The tribal leadership has as a major goal the initiation of economic and development programs designed to meet the needs of the tribal members. Central to that goal is the expansion of the tribe's land base. The Stewart lands will supplement existing ranch lands consisting of 795 acres, permitting an intensive ranch development project.

The Washoe request for this land is supported by the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada. Adjoining private landowners have also approved the Indian request.

I believe the claim of the Washoe Tribe to this land has merit. It would provide a boon to tribal efforts to achieve self sufficiency and would maintain the traditional uses of the property. I urge its early attention.

Mr. LAXALT. Mr. President, I am pleased today to cosponsor legislation with my distinguished colleague from Nevada, Senator CANNON, to transfer to trust status for the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California ranch land surrounding the old Stewart Indian School in Nevada.

The land involved in this legislation was originally a part of the Stewart Indian School complex that was closed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in September 1980. Located in the Carson Valley of Douglas County, the Stewart ranch parcel includes approximately 2,890 acres of ranch and farm lands. The parcel was originally held in fee status and was acquired by the United States for the school site in 1939 and 1940.

I believe that the Washoe Tribe's overall goal of achieving economic self-sufficiency can be greatly enhanced by acquiring these parcels into trust status, thereby complementing the tribe's existing ranch operations. The tribe, in conjunction with its existing lease on the ranch property, has developed a detailed ranch plan which calls for intensive reorganization and development of the resources on the ranch to increase productivity.

Mr. President, prior to our introduction of this bill, Senator CANNON and I asked the tribe to meet with several conditions. These included meeting with adjacent landowners to identify and resolve their concerns, meeting with Carson City officials to discuss that city's needs relative to water rights, and gaining the support of all other tribes in Nevada, and the preparation of a com-

prehensive master plan. The tribe has met all of these conditions and I am convinced that this legislation is in the best interests of all concerned. I look forward to its prompt passage.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 312

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. RUDMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 312, a bill for the relief of Maria and Timofei Chmykhalov, and for Lilia, Peter, Liubov, Lidia and Augustina Vashchenko.

S. 1675

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the Senator from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1675, a bill to help eliminate world hunger and malnutrition and promote global security.

S. 1814

At the request of Mr. JEPSEN, the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1814, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary concerned to comply with the terms of certain court orders in connection with the divorce, dissolution, annulment, or legal separation of a member or former member of a uniformed service and which affect the retired or retainer pay of such a member or former member, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 123

At the request of Mr. HAYAKAWA, the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. COHEN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ), and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTEN) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 123, a joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim "National Disabled Veterans Week".

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 45

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DeCONCINI), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 45, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the rights of the people of Afghanistan.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED FOR PRINTING

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1982

AMENDMENT NO. 633

(Ordered to be printed.)

Mr. HELMS proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 4169) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending

September 30, 1982, and for other purposes.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be authorized to hold a markup during the session of the Senate today, Tuesday, November 17, to discuss S. 1630, the Criminal Code bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 18, to hold a business meeting on pending calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, November 19, at 10 a.m., to hold a confirmation hearing on the nominations of:

Pedro Sanjuan to be Assistant Secretary of Interior for Territorial and International Affairs;

Vernon Wiggins to be Federal Cochairman of the Alaska Land Use Council; and Janet McCoy to be High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NATIONAL DEFENSE

● Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, this summer, the CBS Television Network broadcast a five-part "Defense Special" in which it was suggested that the United States was about to embark on a colossal defense spending spree with few questions asked and with very little debate. To the contrary, I believe the debate has been vigorous and well joined.

It is worth remembering that the foundation for this debate was developed during the late 1970's as the public became increasingly aware of the deficiencies in our defense capabilities in the face of an ever-strengthening Soviet threat. You may recall that just 1 year ago it was virtually impossible to find a major newspaper or periodical or a television commentary dealing with defense, that did not decry the dismal state to which our military forces had been allowed to deteriorate. We had an All-Volunteer Army full of category IV's who could not fight; a Navy with too few ships and too few men to safely put to sea; and an Air Force whose fighters could not launch for want of spare parts and proper maintenance. It was a deplorable situation, but one that the press and media dutifully reported.

Curiously, just 1 year later, it is difficult to find a publication or media com-

mentary that does not suggest defense cuts are now entirely appropriate. Yet what has changed in that brief year? Soviet investment in force modernization and expansion continues unabated. While the condition of our own forces, so deplorable just a year ago, has changed little.

Mr. President, our hope of maintaining a military strong enough to insure our security and discourage Soviet aggression lies not in a politician's promise but in the commitment of a nation. Only with the full and vigorous support of the American people can we hope to restore our Nation's defenses. And we will have this support only if the public remains fully informed.

There are those among the press who have continued to report this issue objectively. They have served the public by reporting the facts rather than manipulating them to fit an editorial conclusion. They have retained the distinction between opinion and fact and take care that their readers know which is which. An editorial published in late September in the Detroit News appraising the CBS Defense Special reflects this philosophy. It represents a standard of journalism from which many could benefit.

I urge all my colleagues to read this exceptional editorial and I ask that it be printed in the Record.

The editorial follows:

CBS NEWS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

The role of loyal opposition is better suited to Britain's parliamentary system than to the American political process that depends upon bipartisan consensus on crucial issues like national defense.

But this reality hasn't dissuaded CBS News from attempting to assume the role. The network's penchant for inveighing against military preparedness was demonstrated—again—when CBS News recently devoted five prime-time hours to a "documentary" entitled "The Defense of the United States."

The series, aired on five consecutive June evenings, was considered so worthy by CBS executives that they rebroadcast it in August. And though the network claimed the documentary expressed no point of view, executive producer Howard Stringer admitted that the program "did draw some conclusions."

Indeed it did.

The CBS "message" was so blatantly anti-military that the American Security Council demanded equal time for rebuttal. John Kester, former special assistant for defense in the Carter administration, charged CBS with exhibiting "the least honest and most seductive" efforts of "the old anti-defense crowd" to conclude "that money spent on national defense is wasted."

Meanwhile, CBS News President Bill Leonard explained that America was "ready to embark on this colossal defense spending spree with few questions asked and very little debate." Series anchorman Dan Rather solemnly agreed, hoping that the documentary would "start the debate rolling in every town and city in America."

There was no mistaking the network's position in the debate. The advisers and interviewees for the series were fairly consistent in their concern about America's drift toward Armageddon. Loaded terms like "Iron Triangle" (the connection between the Pentagon, Congress, and defense contractors), "military-industrial complex," and "closed society" were used liberally. The segment concerning weapons procurement was entitled "The War Machine."

During the whole of the five-part program, there was no mention of the Soviet arms

surge that precipitated President Reagan's response. CBS chose to ignore that while the Soviets spend 11-15 percent of their gross national product (GNP) on the military, the United States spends only 5 percent. Nor was there a reference to Russia's annual defense effort, which in recent years has been nearly 50 percent larger than America's.

Walter Cronkite was brought forth to dismiss the specter of the Soviet buildup, noting, "As for the military spending, the figures are also misleading. Our two systems, our two economies, are so different that to compare the costs of tanks and rocket launchers is just about as meaningful as comparing the costs of a college education."

Rather than dwelling upon the numerical differences, CBS suggested that Americans should be wary of "the largest peacetime military budget in our history" to confront "an enemy who we are told is stronger and more dangerous than ever."

Never mind that the Soviet submarine fleet is the world's largest or that the USSR boasts 4.8 million troops compared to America's 2.1 million. Once again Mr. Cronkite assured viewers that only 10 percent of the Soviet ships "are actually out at sea" and the Russian forces contain "half a million men . . . trained as border guards and construction workers."

Mr. Cronkite failed to add, however, that 100 percent of the Soviet Navy is combat ready, or that Russian border troops are equipped as infantry with automatic weapons, armored vehicles, light artillery, and assault aircraft.

Defense Secretary Weinberger was permitted to assert that the Soviet Union is an expansionist power. Yet CBS cameras gave only a passing glance to a map that the secretary was using to illustrate his point. Then Mr. Cronkite declared: "You can get yourself pretty frightened looking at all the administration's maps and charts of Soviet aggression and military spending. But like so many of our perceptions of the Soviet Union, it tells you only half the story, the half the administration uses to press its case for higher and higher defense budgets."

And if that wasn't soothing enough, Mr. Cronkite laid the Russian threat to rest by concluding, "Since 1960, Soviet influence around the world has actually declined." That astonishing statement omits some nagging exceptions: Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, Grenada, Guyana, Laos, Libya, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Syria, South Yemen, and Vietnam.

CBS, oddly, was more concerned about American belligerence. Two segments concentrated upon the U.S. strategy of fighting a limited nuclear war in Europe that could lead to the continent's devastation. The network was similarly worried about what it characterized as a self-fulfilling prophecy: U.S. military leaders, mesmerized by the nuclear option, might be tempted to launch a pre-emptive strike against the Russians.

An oft-repeated theme throughout the series was that an arms race is futile because neither side can win. Correspondent Richard Threlkeld answered his own rhetorical question, "Do weapons really make us strong?" by adding, "That depends on how you define national security." Commenting on the "conventional wisdom" that promotes military expenditures, Mr. Threlkeld was obviously more impressed by the counter argument that defense spending will destroy the economy. Yet he wearily concluded that Congress rarely asks "hard questions" about defense requests.

The facts suggest otherwise. During the past two decades, Congress has not only asked questions, but it has slashed military spending. Several recent examples come to mind.

In 1973 the Senate cut the Navy's F-14 aircraft request by 73 percent and the Air

Force's B-1 by 22 percent. The House voted for major cuts in funding for the F-15 aircraft, ship construction, and the anti-ballistic missile. A 1975 House committee cut appropriations for the Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) aircraft by 50 percent. That same year, a Senate committee delayed approval of the B-1 bomber, a move that resulted in the airplane's eventual cancellation. In 1976 the Senate pared the MX missile funding request by 39 percent while denying a Navy appeal for a nuclear-powered strike cruiser. Meanwhile the House reduced the Navy cruise-missile program by 40 percent.

Even today, when the "hawks" are supposedly ascendant, Congress has decided to cancel the Pentagon's NAVSTAR Global Positioning System that would put 18 navigation satellites into space directed by a huge ground-control station. The Air Force request for funds to create a new generation of jet fighters has been denied. And the Navy's appeal for \$121 million to design a new class of ships was similarly rebuffed. All told, the House Armed Services Committee has canceled funding for 31 separate weapons projects whose potential costs were in the tens of billions of dollars.

During this period, the Soviet arms buildup dwarfed the U.S. military output. Accordingly, Henry Kissinger gingerly accepted Russia's numerical advantage in the 1972 SALT I agreement because, he concluded, "If you project the existing building program of the Soviet Union into the future you will . . ." see "why we believe that . . ." this ". . . is a good agreement."

Yet CBS News persists in promoting the myth that U.S. military leaders are blindly committed to winning a maniacal arms race at all costs. The charge is hardly original, and we suspect it will continue to be popular among those who equate national defense with self-destruction.

When all is said and done, of course, we must concede that CBS is entitled to its opinions. But it's well to remember that the network has a long history of denigrating the American military, and of selecting its data with a pronounced anti-U.S. bias. It consistently draws its materials through the stained filter of mid-Manhattan dovishness, thus producing portraits of the Pentagon that can only merit the warm endorsement of the nation's adversaries.

We don't know who is responsible for the puzzling slant of CBS News, but we do know that CBS is one of only three major national networks, an arrangement Walter Lippmann once compared to the nightmare vision of America with only three printing presses.

CBS News is enormously influential, possessing as it does a shared monopoly of national television journalism. One would think, therefore, it would be more conscious of its privileged position and exercise its first ethical imperative, that of advising the viewer that a program of editorial comment, based on the network's understanding of events and circumstances, is just that—and is by no means a balanced analysis of American preparedness and the Soviet threat. ●

SENATOR EAST ADDRESSES NORTH CAROLINA TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

● Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this past Friday, my distinguished colleague from North Carolina (Mr. EAST) addressed the annual meeting of the North Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association in Palm Beach, Fla.

Senator EAST spoke to the NCTMA on the need for the U.S. Government to take a tougher stand on foreign textile

and apparel imports. He rightly pointed out that—

The issue here is not "protection" versus "free trade," but rather whether Americans will defend their legitimate economic interests as vigorously as our trading partners defend theirs.

Senator EAST emphasized that—

Given the cutthroat practices that characterize the international market these days, it is a little naive to talk about "free" trade—as if foreign governments did not give every possible advantage to their own commercial interests.

Senator EAST said:

The critical test will be the outcome of the negotiations on the Multifiber Arrangement that resume in Geneva on November 18. The present MFA, which expires on January 1, is patently unfair to American textile and apparel interests.

Mr. President, in order that my colleagues might have the benefit of Senator EAST's comments, I ask that the text of Senator EAST's speech be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The text of the speech follows:

MULTIFIBER ARRANGEMENT

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN P. EAST

I would like to take this opportunity, as a guest of the North Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association, to reaffirm my view that our government must take a tougher stand on foreign textile and apparel imports.

Some 2.7 million Americans, in every region of the country, depend on the fiber/textile/apparel complex for their livelihoods. In Los Angeles, for example, 10 percent of the jobs are in textiles and apparel; in Philadelphia, 21 percent; in Miami, 22 percent; and in New York City, 33 percent.

If the flood of imports continues unchecked, business failures and massive unemployment will result. Minorities and women, who make up a large part of the labor force, will suffer most. The illiterate and unskilled among them will have little hope of finding work elsewhere.

We must not allow this to happen. The issue here is not "protection" versus "free trade," but whether Americans will defend their legitimate economic interests as vigorously as our trading partners defend theirs.

Textiles and apparel are vital and viable industries. In the last 20 years, textile productivity gains alone have averaged 4 percent a year—double the rate for manufacturing in general. All things being equal, these industries can compete.

But all things are not equal. I will not discuss the fact that foreign workers must toil under wage scales and working conditions that would be intolerable in America. Nor will I discuss the more favorable tax structures bestowed by many foreign governments. I am confident that the tax cuts and regulatory reform initiatives undertaken by the Reagan administration will enable American enterprise to hone its competitive edge without sacrificing quality of life.

I will not even discuss the fact that this country shoulders a disproportionate burden for the defense of the free world. It is possible for some of our trade partners—notably Japan—to assume a greater share of that burden, but it is not possible for some others.

What I will discuss here is the question of differing economic systems and economic policies. There is no question that foreign businesses enjoy a greater degree of encouragement and support from their respective governments than their American counterparts receive from ours. Subsidized interest rates, officially-sanctioned cartels and mo-

nopolies, tariff and nontariff barriers to imports are but a few of the benefits that foreign governments accord their major industries.

I am not suggesting that we follow their example by say, repealing the antitrust laws or by merging the Labor and Commerce Departments. We neither can nor should resort to the "state capitalism" devices utilized by our rivals.

What I am saying is that given the cut-throat practices that characterize the international market these days it is a little naive to talk about "free" trade—as if foreign governments did not give every possible advantage to their own commercial interests. I have never met an American exporter who could not argue persuasively that it is easier for foreign companies to do business here than for Americans to do business abroad.

In this light, then, the problems faced by the textile and apparel manufacturers may be properly viewed not as someone else's hard luck story, but as a symbol of the problems faced by all American businesses that must compete internationally. In the same way, the attitude that our government assumes on this issue will be a good indicator of the line it will take on trade issues generally.

The crucial test will be the outcome of the negotiations on the Multifiber Arrangement that resume in Geneva on November 18. The present MFA, which expires on January 1, is patently unfair to American textile and apparel interests. It allows foreigners to increase their exports to this country at a minimum rate of 6 percent a year, at a time when our domestic market can be expected to grow only 1.5 percent a year. Various loopholes in the present treaty, which allow for switching and borrowing from established quotas, allow exporters to increase some shipments by as much as 24 percent.

These loopholes must be plugged, and a new arrangement must be negotiated that will restrict the growth of imports to the growth of the domestic market. I have not hesitated in the past to emphasize this need to U.S. Trade Ambassador Bill Brock and to President Reagan, and I will not hesitate to speak out forcefully in the future. I would hope that the American business and labor communities will recognize the very real stake that they have in the outcome of this issue, and they will add their voices to mine. ●

ATLANTIC ELECTRIC, UTILITY OF THE YEAR

● Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure I bring to the attention of my colleagues that the Atlantic Electric Utility Co. of my State of New Jersey has been selected as the Electric Utility of the Year for 1981 by Electric Light & Power magazine.

This award recognizes the exemplary work Atlantic Electric has accomplished over the past year for its customers, shareholders, and employees. The dedication to its position as a public utility and the progressive nature of its management has enabled this company to outshine its contemporaries in the industry and to faithfully fulfill its goals as a utility.

Unlike other electric utilities in our country today, Atlantic Electric is in an unusual position. Most companies are experiencing a reduction in demand for electric service both as a result of increased conservation efforts and population decreases in their service areas. Atlantic Electric, however, is working hard to meet rising demand, which is expected to continue for the foreseeable

future as the trend of population growth in the region persists.

Mr. President, under normal circumstances, it would be difficult for any utility to effectively respond to such noticeable changes in its service area. Today an even greater burden has been placed on the entire industry by the lingering economic problems which continue to plague our country. Yet, under the able and innovative leadership of Mr. John D. Feehan, the president and chief executive officer of Atlantic Electric, this modest-size utility has met this demand and I am confident they will continue to provide for the needs of the southern one-third of New Jersey.

The November issue of Electric Light & Power magazine contains a special report in honor of Atlantic Electric as Utility of the Year. This article provides an excellent view of this utility and the fine job it has done, and I highly recommend it to my colleagues. Again, I offer my sincere congratulations to John Feehan, his workers, and Atlantic Electric for earning this prestigious award.

Mr. President, I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

ATLANTIC ELECTRIC IS 1981 AWARD UTILITY

Atlantic Electric Co. has been named Electric Light & Power's 1981 Outstanding Electric Utility of the Year. The utility was chosen by a panel of industry judges to be the 13th winner of the annual award.

EL&P Editor Robert Lincicome said the award was based on an impressive three-year financial record, the utility's leading role in converting oil-fired generating capacity back to coal, and an innovative communication program.

Utility president and chief executive officer John Feehan expressed appreciation for the award and noted that the company faces even stiffer challenges in coming years. With growth in demand in recent years sparked by the introduction of nine gambling casinos and hotels in Atlantic City, the utility must deal with unprecedented capital requirements that total twice the company's current assets in the next decade, Feehan said. (One interesting technique being explored for raising capital at Atlantic Electric is explained in the article below.)

Over the past three years the utility has recorded an almost unmatched record of improvement in earnings: a seven percent gain in 1978 to \$2.21 a share; another seven percent increase in 1979 to \$2.36 a share; and an eleven percent rise in 1980 to a record \$2.36 a share.

Part of the impressive earnings record is due to the company's swift replacement of imported oil with coal as a power plant fuel. When the company's largest generating station, the B. L. England station, was converted to oil for environmental reasons in the early 1970s the company retained all the coal-burning equipment and kept it maintained. The station was back on coal one month after the 1973 Arab oil embargo, making it the first utility to convert back. The company is now converting its other major station, the Deepwater plant, back to coal also and is aiming at reducing its oil dependence to 10 percent.

GOALS FOR THE 80's

1. Reduce construction expenditures holding annual levels to below 12 percent of capitalization.
2. Maximize internal generation of cash in order to reduce outside financing (minimum of 50 percent internal generation).
3. Increase the return on equity to a level high enough to allow common stock to sell at or above book value.

4. Provide customers with reliable electric service at a price that reflects their contribution to cost.

5. Minimize load growth while maintaining a viable economy.

ELECTRIC UTILITY OF THE YEAR FOR 1981: ATLANTIC ELECTRIC FINDS GOLD IN REDUCED GROWTH, NEW DIRECTION

(By Robert A. Lincicome and Robert W. Smock)

Small but mighty is perhaps the most apt description of Atlantic Electric.

The utility, which serves some 380,000 customers in southern New Jersey, was selected by EL&P's panel of industry judges to be the 1981 recipient of the magazine's annual award of excellence. The award is the thirteenth to be given since the program was initiated in 1969.

Among the major factors highlighting the company's award-winning performance were the following:

A virtually unmatched record of improvement in earnings over the past 3 years and a 28-year history of annual dividend increases every year.

An impressive program for reducing dependence on imported oil, predating general industry concerns, that has decreased oil usage from 67 percent of total company generation in the early 1970's to less than 20 percent today, plus achieving a diverse balance of fuel sources;

An operating record founded on high availability and reliability of all major components;

An aggressive, open two-way communication aimed at improving the understanding of customers, regulators, legislators and company management for the positions, problems and needs of each other;

A flexible, innovative approach to dealing with the problems imposed by new social and economic imperatives.

STEADY STRENGTHENING

Although EL&P's award was based largely on the strength of the company's 1980 performance, recognition also was given to the company's almost-constant strengthening over the past 8 years. The growth trend dates back to the time current president John D. Feehan assumed the chief executive officer's post and began to address what was then beginning to develop as a new era of trials and tribulations for the electric industry.

Feehan, an affable, easy-going executive was the right man for the times. He and his staff approached the mid-70's with a flexible, but pragmatic philosophy. The questions were not about how to reshape the developing environment to fit the plans of the utility, but rather how to best adapt the company's programs and plans to conform to the stricter imperatives of the times in the best interests of its customers and shareholders.

RESULTS

The results? After suffering a down-grading of its debt issues just after Feehan assumed the CEO's position, the company has steadily climbed back, getting a firmer grip on its construction program, improving its capital structure and moving away from its former heavy dependence on imported oil.

Following the post-embargo ups and downs of the mid-70's, Atlantic Electric posted a 7 percent earnings gain in 1978, to \$2.21 per share. The next year, 1979, it added another 7 percent earnings gain, to \$2.36 per share. Last year, earnings per share of common rose an additional 11 percent, to \$2.62. Through June of this year, it has jumped upward by 64 percent over the same period in 1980 on the strength of the 16 percent rate relief granted by the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities in September, 1980. Dividends, which have been increased every year for 27 years went up again in

1980, a 28-year record equalled by only a few utilities.

The 1980 increase in earnings came on revenue gains of 27 percent. However, expenses increased even faster, 28 percent, although kWh sales were up only 6 percent.

Return on common equity, as a result of the \$50 million rate increase received in September 1980, rose to 11.6 percent by year-end, and by mid-1981 was almost 14 percent, above the statutory 13.75 percent allowable ROR granted by the P.U.B.

Moreover, Atlantic Electric has been granted emergency rate relief aimed at recovering a portion of the \$76-million deficiency in fuel adjustment clause collections, which will improve the quality of its earnings in 1982. The balance of the levelized energy adjustment under-recovery will be subject to further rate actions in 1982.

In non-financial areas Atlantic Electric also has made substantial progress.

It has moved ahead in its quest to regain its former AA bond rating. The company is now rated A+ and is continuing its program to gain the AA rating in the near future. To this end it has launched, and is continuing an aggressive information program to keep rating houses, as well as individual brokers, up-to-date in their knowledge of the company and its performance.

The company also continues to work hard to gain better understanding of its needs and problems by consumers. To accomplish this the company is conducting an active two-way communication program with its customers.

And for employees, the company is pursuing its goals of more and better training, affirmative action programs and direct two-way communications with company management. Labor satisfaction appears to be strong. As one union member remarked, "The only way they'll get rid of me is to shoot me!"

GOALS-ORIENTED PROGRESS

John Feehan and his four senior vice presidents have made Atlantic Electric's small size a virtue. They work hard at it.

Feehan is a strong believer in setting specific goals and objectives at all levels, and of measuring progress against those goals. "We don't make 'em all," he remarked, "but we achieved a lot more than if we'd reacted to outside developments."

For example, a review of 1980 goals shows the company did achieve a 10 percent step up of its public relations programs. It simplified its bill format to make it easier for customers to understand, but it failed to achieve its goal of initiating one new conservation initiative, nor did it reduce peak demand growth to zero. For share holders, the company improved earnings performance 11 percent and dividends 7.6 percent compared to its 6 percent goal for both. It did not achieve its goal of regaining its former AA bond rating. Operationally, it did return two targeted generating units to coal and launched a corporate planning function and corporate model as planned. It achieved its affirmative action goals but fell short of its training goal and its goal of no fatal accident.

THREE KEYS TO SUCCESS

Corporate officers point to three unique reasons for the company's success: planned diversity, open two-way communications and total flexibility in its approaches to meeting financial and management goals.

To Feehan and his staff, planned diversity means diversity in just about everything; in management, loads, capacity, and fuel sources.

Because of its modest size, Atlantic Electric has been able to buy small participation in large generating units of other, bigger utilities. This has spread involvement over many different kinds of units . . . including nuclear, which it could never have afforded on its own . . . and providing the economies

of scale where they otherwise could not have been attained.

The diversity of generating sources, in addition to providing a diversity of fuel bases also contributes to overall system reliability and insulates the company from the devastating effects an outage of a single, major station might otherwise cause. It has, says J. L. Jacobs, senior vice president-finance, been a major factor in the company's low forced outage rate, which has allowed the company to participate in the Pennsylvania-Jersey-Maryland (PJM) interconnection with reserves well under the average 22 percent margin required. It also has enabled Atlantic Electric to curtail construction of some 125 MW of new capacity, representing nearly 10 percent of total system capacity.

Communications is one of Feehan's major concerns. "Credibility," he says, "tends to work conversely to the size of customers' bills." The most promising approach to combatting this, he said, was to develop a personal relationship, a realistic alternative given the utility's size.

A first approach was to establish two-way conference telephone hookups with high school classes in certain specified communities. It was Feehan's personal project; CEO to student, direct, not a downline function. The conference calls allowed Feehan to discuss company activities and concerns, as well as broader energy issues, to answer specific questions or respond to rumors and myths. Over four years, 36 of these phone conferences have been held. Not only have they been effective in helping students understand the nation's as well as the region's energy problems, and the needs and concerns of the company, but there has been a side benefit of better understanding by parents.

Another effective communications program has been the company's series of roundtables. The first of these were held with editors, publishers and educators; then were broadened to include customers. These later consumer roundtables are free-wheeling monthly meetings with Feehan and with his four senior vice-presidents. Consumer participation is by invitation. Typical participants are representatives of consumer or environmental groups, people who have written complaint letters about the utility to local newspapers or to the company directly, and local officials concerned about the utility service or issues.

Roundtable participants select the topics of discussion, not company officials. Many of the meetings revolve around the interaction of members, rather than from one-way messages from the company. Begun on a centralized basis, the roundtables now are held in each of the six counties served by the company.

In other communications areas, the conventional speakers bureau has been revitalized. Frequent meetings are held with the state regulatory commission. Open houses have been held at company plants. Energy Awareness Expositions have been held at local shopping centers. Meetings are held with small groups of employees to ensure understanding of company programs and to answer any and all employee questions.

Interestingly, the executive offices at Atlantic Electric are shirt-sleeve work areas. And, more often than not, the CEO, senior v.p.s and other managers answer their own phones.

The third area is the flexibility inherent in Atlantic Electric management. It is, perhaps, a characteristic of most small organizations that they can act or react swiftly, even reversing direction if need be. To the extent that Atlantic Electric is small by American electric utility standards, it enjoys this advantage. But the company is not really small in real terms, and its flexibility is really more a matter of attitude.

Feehan and his entire management team maintain open minds, seeking optimum solutions to the problems and obstacles facing them. Supported by a board of essentially outside directors, without ingrained industry preconceptions, Atlantic Electric's management is free to approach problems in new and creative ways, through non-traditional avenues.

It is this flexibility that made it possible for the company to meet the demands of Atlantic City's newest industry, gambling casinos. In a 3-year period, the company was called upon to compress its planning, engineering and construction functions to accommodate nine new casino customers, each with average peak demand equal to the systems' normal total annual peak growth.

And it is this flexibility that has allowed the company to move forward in a new direction for company development—toward a stronger company through aggressive promotion of conservation and a zero-demand growth future.

NEW DIRECTION

Looking at the future of Atlantic Electric, the most interesting aspect is the "new direction" for the company—a formal conservation program launched last April to allow the company to hold demand growth down and maintain control of its construction requirements.

Atlantic Electric faces a real problem. It is one of the few electric utilities in the Northeast experiencing vigorous growth in demand. The company's average increase in energy growth over the past 5 years has been more than 4 percent, spurred in part by the revitalization of the Atlantic City area economy resulting from introduction of gambling casinos. Last year, both peak and kWh demand increased by 6 percent.

The company's forecast sees demand rising at nearly 3 percent per year for the rest of the decade if left unchecked. In an effort to hold its construction requirements down over the past 5 years, the company has added little generating capacity. Its reserve capacity is at a relatively low level. Peak demand in 1980 was 1262 MW, while its generating capacity was 1435 MW, resulting in a 13.7 percent reserve. While this reserve is well below the level required of PJM interconnected pool members, AE gets by because of a combination of its size and its historically high availability and reliability levels.

CEO Feehan says that the capital cost, at current interest rate levels, of added capacity to meet unbridled demand over the next 10 years would be close to \$2 billion. If demand continues to grow unchecked over the next 5 years the company would have to spend about \$900 million on new construction. "That means," he explained to employees in one of a series of some 60 meetings held since last April, "that in the next 5 years we would have to double the \$900 million we've invested in Southern New Jersey over the past 95 years. Continuing further on the same road we would have to triple our investment within the next 10 years."

Feehan simply doesn't believe it can be done. "It's just not in the cards," he says. Over the past 5 years the company has found it difficult enough to support capital spending totaling \$280 million and to regain its AA bond rating (an as yet unachieved goal).

"We are convinced," Feehan told the annual shareholders' meeting in April, "that Atlantic Electric must embark on a new program which will meet the needs of the people of southern New Jersey while we make every reasonable and even some unreasonable efforts to reduce the massive construction program we face. We have got to lower our construction expenditures somehow."

The attempt to reduce capital requirements will have four elements:

An "aggressive" promotion of conservation, Use of load management techniques,

Encouragement of alternative energy sources by customers such as solar water heating and windmills, and

"Pursuit of opportunities to have others make needed investments" for the company. These investments could be made by cogenerators, other utilities, government agencies, or anybody else, Feehan explains.

Can a significant reduction in growth and capital needs be achieved? Feehan hopes so but, more importantly, points out that the company has no choice but to make the attempt. Even if it can't fend off long-term growth, adds Senior Vice-President Jerrold Jacobs, the company may at least be able to buy some time and put off borrowing in the present market.

Also, progress in this direction will improve the quality of earnings, as well as the quantity, according to Vice-President-Control J. A. Salomone, a key to more favorable financing in the future.

It may prove impossible to influence demand, company officials agree. When the company was aggressively selling electricity it got one-third of the residential heating market; now that company "salesmen" are suggesting that customers look into natural gas, half of all new homes in the service territory are being built with electric heat.

Atlantic Electric is a firm believer in quantitative goals, and that appears to be a major reason for its success in recent years. Its goals for the future include holding residential rate increases below the inflation rate and improving its capital structure to 45-49 percent debt, 38-40 percent common, and 13-15 percent preferred. If the "new direction" works, it may achieve its goals.

STRENGTH THROUGH DIVERSITY

As mentioned, CEO Feehan is a strong believer in spreading risks or, as he calls it, "strength through diversity." Probably the best example of the pay off from that philosophy is the story of fuel conversions at Atlantic Electric's B. L. England station, which has two units which were built to burn coal.

As with most northeastern coal-burning power plants state air pollution authorities forced a switch to low-sulfur oil to reduce sulfur dioxide pollution. Commenting in 1971 on these regulations, Feehan—then a vice president of Atlantic Electric—said, "These measures have forced shift from coal to oil as a fuel with massive conversions along the east coast aggravating the shortage of oil. The low sulfur oil required is unique to only certain areas of the world; other sources must be desulfurized. We have been thrown into a Mid-east fuel market which is fraught with unrest, tax increases and threats to cut-off the supply."

Such warnings were not unusual back then, but Atlantic Electric carried the philosophy one step further. Even though it was forced to rely on imported oil for most of its generation, the company maintained its coal-burning capability at England station so that it could rapidly switch back. When the oil embargo struck in October, 1973, England was back on coal within a month, the first station to do so.

The company has reduced its dependence on oil from 62 percent to 20 percent right now and has set a goal of 10 percent oil by 1989 by completing the conversion back to coal at its Deepwater station. The company's current generating facilities and fuel mix looks like this:

- Deepwater, 281 MW, coal/oil/gas
- England, 449 MW, coal/oil
- Various combustion turbines, 360 MW, oil and gas.
- Ownership of shares of units operated by other utilities.
- Keystone, 41 MW, coal.
- Conemaugh, 65 MW, coal.
- Peach Bottom, 157 MW, nuclear.
- Salem, 1, 80 MW nuclear.
- Firm purchases, 47 MW.

The company's goal is to broaden its fuel and generating diversity with the following planned additions (if necessary) for the rest of the decade:

- Share of Salem 2, 83 MW, nuclear, in 1981.
- Share of Hope Creek 1, 53 MW, nuclear, in 1986.

- Share of Hope Creek 2, 54 MW, nuclear, in 1988.

- Cumberland 1, a 290 MW coal unit to be built in 1988 and operated by the company which will own 260 MW of the total.

- Share of Vienna 9, 125 MW, coal-fired, in 1988.

The basic philosophy, says Engineering Senior Vice President Frank Ficadenti, is to buy small shares of large units. The company feels that the construction of the Cumberland station is necessary, however, to maintain a reasonable amount of capacity directly under Atlantic Electric control.

Ficadenti, in charge of the company's forecasting effort, feels that the casino impact has peaked out. At one time a maximum of 25 gambling casinos were expected. At present there are eight operating, and one being completed. Several projects have foundered, leading Ficadenti to believe that saturation has been reached. The impact, however, is large and its ripples will be felt out into the future. Ficadenti calculates the total effect of bringing gambling to Atlantic City, both direct and indirect, at 125 MW by 1995.

The overall, 15-year forecast for the whole service territory, the southern one third of New Jersey, is for a compound growth rate of peak demand of 2.7 percent per year. With the added capacity outlined above, total generating capability will rise to 2223 MW by 1995, compared to 1483 MW now.

The fuel mix is now 26 percent oil, 47 percent coal, and 27 percent nuclear. By 1989, completion of the units shown and the planned conversions would change the fuel mix to 61 percent coal, 36 percent nuclear, and 13 percent oil.

COAL CONVERSION

The conversion back to coal is an "over-riding goal" for the company in the opinion of Ernest Huggard, senior vice president in charge of operations. He explains that half the company's cost of doing business is fuel cost. With two units at the England station (totaling 290 MW) and one 80 MW unit converted at the Deepwater station, the difference in fuel cost is \$60 million a year.

When the second unit at Deepwater (another 80 MW unit) is converted, another \$10 million a year will be saved at today's prices. That \$70 million total saving can be compared to Atlantic Electric's overall fuel and interchange energy expense of \$200 million a year. The total cost to convert England and Deepwater will be \$140 million, with the utility's cogeneration partner at Deepwater, DuPont, picking up \$55 million of the expense.

The entire story of the coal conversion is a fascinating tale of engineering innovations, searches for fuel, and environmental compromises. In next month's EL&P we'll devote a separate feature article to explaining how Atlantic Electric helped lead the way in coal conversion and how the current conversion plant at the Deepwater station is progressing.

SMOOTH OPERATIONS

Vice president in charge of production, Henry Schwemm, is proud of the low company-wide forced outage rate, particularly in view of the large amount of coal-fired capacity. The practical effect of the smooth operation of the company's power plants is that its reserve obligation to the PJM interconnection is a low 10 percent, compared to a PJM planning requirement of 22 percent. The major factor in determining a company's reserve obligation is forced outage rate, explains Senior Vice President Huggard.

Looking into the next 10 years, the company figures to save as much as \$175 million in capital expense by avoiding the need to build 1.5 MW due to the reduced reserve obligation.

The key to high availability, says Huggard, "is a good planned maintenance program—and don't deviate from it." For example, the company used to have a normal, day-shift maintenance force at its major generating stations, Huggard explains. Now they have 24-hour, three-shift maintenance coverage at the England station. There's also heavy emphasis on planned outages. The two coal-burning cyclone-type boilers at the England station are each taken out twice a year for three to four week overhauls. These two boilers, now considered to be at mid-life, are slated for a major, \$16 million rehabilitation. The cyclone furnaces, wall tubes, and most other heat exchange surfaces will be replaced.

Huggard explains that another reason for the company's availability record is the relatively low unit size. The largest company-owned and operated steam unit is 160 MW.

That philosophy can also be seen in the capacity expansion plan. The major new facility to be built and operated by the company, the coal-fired Cumberland unit, is to be only 290 MW in size. That's twice the size of the largest existing unit, but relatively small compared to what other utilities are planning for the eighties. "It's a manageable size for us," says Huggard.

The company is also proud of its gas-turbine maintenance group. "It's one of the most flexible, cost-effective programs we have," says Huggard. Atlantic Electric operates 350 MW of gas turbine capacity at six locations, all over its service territory.

The gas turbines are remotely operated, but require constant attention from one of two maintenance gangs. There's one group in the eastern part of the company's service territory and one in the west, each with its own mechanics, engineers, and support staff. The company negotiated the right to train the mechanics to cross traditional trade lines to attain the flexibility needed to work on gas turbines. The result has been extremely smooth running units with what Huggard claims is an extremely high start reliability.

John Born, vice president of electric operations, notes that the gas turbines are extensively used as synchronous condensers during high load periods. For example, the two most heavily used units devoted more than 12 percent of their running hours to synchronous condenser duty during 1980. For all gas turbines operated by Atlantic Electric, an average of 3.5 percent of running hours were dedicated to synchronous condenser duty.

Born points out that the concept of flexibility also applies to the company's transmission and distribution workforce of 300. "These people are not specialists," he says. Any member of a line crew can do any part of a job. Some crews are used to build new facilities, others for installation, others for maintenance and repair.

The company is divided into nine electrical operating districts, Born explains. District size ranges from 35 to 60 people. There is a separate group that handles transmission level underground work, submarine cable work, and the Atlantic City underground network. Each district also has from three to six people that specialize in buried distribution.

The company workforce has remained at the same level for the past 8 years, says Born, even though kWh sales have increased by one-third. One reason for this achievement is the institution of a work-force management system about 5 years ago, he explains. Currently, 99 percent of all T&D work is pre-engineered and written up ahead of time. A computerized system generates all the paperwork, a bill of materials, labor esti-

mate, etc. From 500,000 to 600,000 manhours of work a year is pre-planned. Born says that the company has relied on outside contract crews to supplement company crews but in the past year the contract force has been reduced by 25 percent.

A vehicle maintenance expense control system is being developed for the transportation maintenance force, Born adds. That group is responsible for the company's trucks, trenchers, tensioners, construction equipment, etc. All light vehicle maintenance is done at district garages, but the heavy work is now done at a central garage.

One of the trickiest operational problems was co-ordinating company crews with casino construction, explains senior vice president Huggard. Downtown Atlantic City is served by an underground duct network. The company didn't want to delay a casino opening by installing service too late and, on the other hand, didn't want to waste resources by installing too early, since each installation was a major project. (All but one of the casinos are served at 23kV and they average about five megawatts each.)

The coordination was complicated by the prohibition on under-ground work in downtown Atlantic City during the annual summer tourist season, from June 1 to Sept. 1, adds Engineering Vice President Frank Ficadenti. In order to accommodate the nine new casinos, the entire electrical system had to be beefed up by adding one new 69-kV feeder to the "island" of Atlantic City, by upgrading the existing feeders, by building a new 69/23 kV substation, by adding a 69/23 facility at an existing sub, and by installing new duct banks (with as many as 12 ducts per bank.)

Somehow, it's all worked out and most of the work is now completed, Ficadenti feels. As many as 25 casinos were once forecast for the city, but with eight now in and one being completed, Ficadenti feels, "That's it."

The balance of the company's existing T&D projects are aimed at reinforcing the transmission system, chiefly the east-west ties between the load and generation centers on the Atlantic coast and the Delaware River valley. ●

THE MARION COUNTY LAWYERS' CLUB

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to submit for the Record a copy of a speech given by J. Clay Smith, Jr., acting chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, to the Marion County Bar Association on October 24, 1981.

This speech reviews the historical and commendable contribution that have been made by Indiana's black lawyers in the pursuit of civil rights and of putting and end to discrimination.

As a strong supporter of extension of the Voting Rights Act, I support and encourage the continuation of the positive accomplishments and goals of the Marion County Bar Association.

The speech follows:

SPEECH OF DR. J. CLAY SMITH, JR.¹

I am delighted that you invited me to the great state of Indiana—a state that has had

¹ Dr. Smith received his A.B. from the Creighton University in Omaha, Nebraska, in 1964; J.D. from Howard University School of Law in 1967; LL.M. in 1970 and S.J.D. in 1977 from the George Washington National Law Center, respectively. This paper is respectfully dedicated to Henry J. Richardson, Jr., and H. Elsie Austin, who both have touched many lives in Indianapolis, our nation and the world.

within its borders such persons as Elwood Haynes of Kokomo, Indiana, an automobile inventor; Orville Wright, of Newcastle, Indiana, who invented the airplane; and C. F. Jenkins, of Richmond, Indiana, who invented the movie machine. I am also delighted to be in Marion County, in which the Marion County Lawyers' Club was founded around 1925.

That the Marion County Lawyers' Club now renamed the Marion County Bar Association, and its members have made a substantial contribution to Marion County, the city of Indianapolis, the state of Indiana, and of course, to the nation is not arguable. The name of the Marion County Lawyers' Club was changed to the Marion County Bar Association on October 27, 1942. I do not know the names of the 1925 founders of the Marion County Lawyers' Club. However, in 1942 six lawyers were listed as incorporators of the Marion County Bar Association; namely, Moses Wilson Beene, James Battey, E. L. Moore, Will Porter, R. B. H. Smith, and E. L. Johnson. Except for Will Porter, these gentlemen also constituted the first board of directors of the association, along with three other lawyers; namely, Howard Hooper, W. W. Hyde and Robert Lee Brokenburr.

This paper will not attempt to cover the long and distinguished history of the Marion County Lawyers' Club. The contents of my remarks will review the Eighth Annual Convention of the National Bar Association, hosted by the Marion County Lawyers' Club on August 4-6, 1932, here in Indianapolis, Indiana.² Hence, I have entitled this paper, "The Marion County Lawyers' Club—1932: A Peep at the 1980's."

In 1932 Indianapolis had two bar associations—the Indianapolis Bar Association and the Marion County Lawyers' Club. At that time Paul G. Davis was president of the Indianapolis Bar Association and Forrest W. Littlejohn was president of the Marion County Lawyers' Club. The Indianapolis Bar Association had 400 members; there were approximately 1,000 lawyers in Indianapolis, and 1,110 lawyers in the state. The Marion County Lawyers' Club had approximately 50 members; there were approximately 50 Afro-American lawyers in Indianapolis and fewer than 60 Afro-American lawyers in the state. Records reveal that the Indianapolis Bar Association did not have a race restriction membership provision in 1932. This fact is gleaned from a speech by James M. Ogden, who in 1932 was the Attorney General of Indiana. In a speech during the National Bar Association convention, Mr. Ogden stated, "Some of your members [the members of the National Bar Association] are members of our organization [Indianapolis Bar Association] as well." NBA Proceedings at 61. Mr. Ogden's remarks were obviously referring to the members of the Marion County Lawyers' Club. This is an interesting fact since many volunteer bar associations denied Black lawyers admission as late as 1950. I do not know what the admission policy of the Indiana State Bar Association was or whether a state bar association existed at all.

In the 1920's and 1930's Afro-American lawyers practiced in five cities in Indiana: Gary, Michigan City, Richmond, South Bend and Indianapolis. According to a lawyers' directory published by the NBA in 1932, the following lawyers practiced law or lived in Indianapolis: (last name first) Austin, Elsie H., 229½ Indiana Ave.; Bailey, R.L., 46 Pa. Ave.; Battey, James M., 229½ Indiana Ave.; Beatty, J. W., 152½ E. Court St.; Beckwith, Frank R., 2232 Hovey St.; Beene, Moses W., 152½ E. Court St.; Brokenburr, Robert Lee, 45 Pa. Ave.; Browder, John, 152½ E. Court

St.; Brown, Joseph K., Walker Bldg.; Bryant, Lawyer, 152½ E. Court St.; Bryant, James A., 229½ Indiana Ave.; Grant, Marshall, 401 N. Senate St.; Grant, Wilbur H., 401 N. Senate St.; Henderson, W. E., 152½ E. Court St.; Henry, W. S., 229½ Indiana Ave.; Hooper, Howard, 227½ E. Washington St.; Hyde, W. W., 152½ E. Court St.; Jacobs, Carey, 1213 N. West St.; Johnson, E. L., 152½ E. Court St.; Littlejohn, F. W., 46 N. Pa. Ave.; Longwood, Bee, 152½ E. Court St.; Moore, E. Lewis, 227½ E. Washington St.; Perry, H. R., 533 N. Senate Ave.; Ransom, F. B., 640 N. West St., Walker Bldg.; Richardson, Henry J. Jr., 229½ Indiana Ave.; J. Wellman Smith, 229½ Indiana Ave.; R. B. H. Smith, 152½ E. Court St.; Terrace A. C., 226 W. Vermont St.; Thurston C. H., 229½ Indiana Ave.; Williams Frank, 152½ E. Court St.

Several of the members of the Marion County Lawyers' Club held important positions in the National Bar Association. For example Freeman B. Ransom was a Vice President of the NBA and was a member of the Committee on Convention, the Committee on Legislation, and the Credentials Committee. Ransom was also a consultant to Mary McLeod Bethune in her capacity as Director of the Division of Negro Affairs, National Youth Administration. He is listed as a consultant to the 1939 Second National Conference on The Problems of The Negro and Negro Youth held in Washington. He served on the Committee on Civil Liberties and Political Suffrage, along with Ms. H. Elsie Austin another Hoosier, Afro-American woman lawyer. See Proceedings of The Second National Conference on The Problems of The Negro and Negro Youth, Washington, D.C., January 12-14, 1939, at p. 58.

Robert Lee Brokenburr was a member of the NBA Committee of Jurisprudence and Law Reform, the Publicity Committee and the Committee on Affiliation of Bar Associations. H. R. Wilson was a member of the NBA Credentials Committee and the Committee on Annual Bar Day. Henry J. Richardson, Jr.³ was a member of the National Bar Association Legal Directory Committee. Robert L. Bailey was an NBA member of the Budget Committee serving as Vice-Chair. Mr. Bailey was also Assistant Attorney General of Indiana.

The 1932 Convention was held in the Walker Casino—owned by the famous millionaire Madam C. J. Walker, an Afro-American woman, who for a time lived in Indianapolis. February 10, 1910, was the day that Madam Walker arrived in Indianapolis, Indiana. So impressed was she by the city's business possibilities for Blacks and the cordiality extended to her, she decided to make it her home. A home on North West Street with the factory in the rear became the first Madam C. J. Walker Manufacturing Company. Two years later, adjoining space at 644 North West Street was purchased for expansions. Two young lawyers, Freeman B. Ransom and Robert Lee Brokenburr, who roomed with Mme. Walker, gave her free legal advice. Attorney Brokenburr filed the Articles of Incorporation on September 19, 1911, with Mme. Walker as the sole owner. F. B. Ransom gave up his law practice to become General Manager of the company until his death, in 1947, while Mr. Brokenburr retained his private practice, plus served as Assistant Manager. The company's growth rate was astronomical. Outside of the U.S., Walker products were in demand. The Foreign Trade Department was opened after her 1913 trip to Panama, Cuba and the West Indies. The Walker Company

³ See Richardson, Report of the Legal Aid Division of the National Bar Association, Inc., 1 National Bar Association Journal 130 (1942). At this writing Mr. Richardson is the oldest living member of the Marion County Bar Association.

gave employment to hundreds of Blacks, particularly during a time when America's economic future was bleak.

The splendid nature of the Walker Building was noted after welcoming remarks of the then Mayor of Indianapolis Reginald H. Sullivan by Perry W. Howard, a Republican National Committeeman from the State of Mississippi. Attorney Howard stated:

"We are delighted to be in Indianapolis; to be in this splendid building—the handiwork of a noble woman and constructed under the management of a gentleman for whom we have the highest regard as a member of the bar—Honorable F. B. Ransom—than whom we have no finer man in the country." Id. at 59.

I know that you have asked me to address the role of the black lawyer in the 1980's. With your permission, I choose to follow my own course of reviewing the mind of the Afro-American lawyer in 1932 which has a direct bearing on the issues of the 1980's. Hearing no objections—I shall proceed.

During the 1932 NBA Convention hosted by the Marion County Lawyers' Club some very profound concepts emerged from the mouths of now historic Afro-Americans. These concepts confirm my assessment of the strict confidence that Afro-American lawyers had in the judicial process and the judicial systems of America, and their total rejection of communism. For example, Perry Howard spoke about the consequence of the "lack of faith in our system of jurisprudence." Mr. Howard stated:

"We have faith in our courts and faith in the institutions of our country. We have faith in the Executive of our country. We are not going to turn communist and we are not going to turn anarchist, but with faith in God and the courts and learned in the law, we are going to fight it out for justice . . ." Id. at 60.

From the very beginning of the Afro-American lawyer on this continent in 1845, the plight of the Black lawyer has been peculiar. Segregation retarded the Afro-American lawyer's growth and development to diversify his practice in specialized civil law areas, to diversify his client base, to break into corporate law firms, corporate and government legal offices and to diversify the courts of our nation at every level. Perry Howard noted this theme in his speech before the NBA in 1932 here in Indianapolis. He stated:

"Our colored attorney has a fight that is peculiar. Segregation has a tendency to prevent our receiving a fair deal. Learned as they are in the law, if we ever get what is coming it will have to be through the leadership of the lawyers of this country. From everywhere we have come and met on Indiana soil; we find here the best of our group—the National Bar Association—in the City of Indianapolis." Id. at 60.

This statement is very important because it asserts a position that is jurisprudential in nature and one which explains why the Afro-American bar exists today. From this statement we learn that Afro-American lawyers are unique; that race restrictions deterred Afro-American lawyers in the profession of law; that scholarship alone is not the sole test of upward mobility; and that the legal profession as a collective body must assert itself to eradicate discrimination and its impact.

In 1932 when the Afro-American lawyers met in Indianapolis, Herbert Hoover was the president of the United States. In the Spring of 1931, the depression in Europe reached panic proportions when a banking crisis struck Austria and spread rapidly into Germany. As you recall, the catastrophic crash of the Wall Street stock market in October, 1929, heralded the great depression. That depression spread to Europe. The economic conditions of Europe and its economic isolation, and a worsening of its financial and political chaos, spawned Adolf Hitler.

In 1932 large segments of the American population were suffering from unemployment, bankruptcy and strife. Afro-Americans were in a perilous state. Black lawyers from all over the nation came to Indianapolis, Indiana to stake their claim deeper into America values, and simultaneously to hold America accountable for the plight of Black people. During the Indianapolis meeting, Jesse S. Heslip, from Toledo, Ohio, the president of the National Bar Association, gave the keynote address entitled, "Straight Ahead, We Cannot Detour, We Will Not Retreat." It is within the contexts of President Heslip's address that the conditions of the world of Black America and the role of the Black Lawyer in the 1930's are laid bare.

President Heslip spoke about the conditions existing in Western Europe, the British Empire, the Far East, in Africa and South America. He stated:

"Practically the whole of Western Europe is seething in misery. . . . The British Empire is facing the gravest future. . . . We are fully cognizant of the suffering in the Far East. . . . Africa is virtually broken. . . . South American Republics are daily engaged in civil commotion. . . ."

President Heslip then described the conditions existing in the United States. He said:

"The average citizen of these United States a few months ago looked upon this panorama with a sense of security from the agitation and distress which he saw in other parts of the world. With our statesmen, editors and bankers declaring in God-like fashion that 'prosperity was just around the corner' this average citizen felt himself God's selected saint. The United States boasts that it is the wealthiest and most enlightened nation of the family. Yet hardly any other nation, blessed with America's facilities, could so fail and neglect to provide ways and means of relief from these economic and political burdens as miserably, miserly and ignorantly as our Federal Government.

"With bank failures as common as daylight; with no sound and safe economic program proposed by either of our major parties; with farmers and urban homes staggering under unprincipled mortgage loan; with diseased parents and undernourished children uncared for; with smokeless factories, rusted machinery, and bankrupt business, and with approximately 12,000,000 unemployed, the United States offers only bread lines and soup kitchens as its relief to its distressed and tormented citizens.

"Unemployment is the rule of today. And with unemployment, selfishness and intolerance have increased to the point where substantial numbers of the American people are on the brink of extinction. . . ."

"Along with this economic upheaval, there is an increasing racial prejudice. We find race prejudice in America greatly intensified and extending to almost every phase of our life. It is firmly believed that our economic condition, causing unparalleled unemployment, has given rise to more selfishness and more intolerance. . . ."

"The Negro occupies the lowest and most unsafe position in America's economic program. We are the first wards of the public charity, as a rule, because we occupy a very insecure economic position. What can the Negro business and professional man expect in the way of economic safety and prosperity with any reasonable degree of permanency when he is primarily dependent upon Negro labor for patronage and support? All about us we see Negro homes falling under the crash of the judicial hammer at foreclosure sales; we witness Negro families scattered and broken by reason of poverty forced upon them through the inability of the chief bread winners to sustain them by decent labor; we find otherwise respectable Negro men and women seizing upon boot-legging and prostitution as means of livelihood, not by choice, but because of this most detestable and

prejudicial economic scheme. The Negro church, school, and home are the background of our social life. With these institutions devastated by poverty may not the Negro business and professional men reasonably anticipate their own collapse?" Id. at 66, 69.

A point for emphasis here is president Heslip's concern about the impact of the economy on the profession of the practice of law by the Afro-American lawyer, and on the Afro-American population as a whole. Heslip's declaration that the "Negro occupies the lowest and most unsafe position in America's economic program" could be argued today. Heslip asserts that the "Negro lawyer must prepare himself to meet these issues . . . [and] become thoroughly grounded in constitutional law." Id. at 71. Finally, and in the tradition that characterizes the Afro-American lawyer's faith in our constitutional democracy, Heslip states that the "Negro lawyer . . . must be ready to face the nation's highest tribunal in search of justice for ourselves. . . . We are consecrated to the sacred task of extending to the Negro equal economic opportunity and the full indicia of peace, life and liberty." *Ibid.*

Other great speeches were given here in Indianapolis during the 1932 convention of the National Bar Association hosted by the Marion County Lawyer's Club. Walter White the Executive Secretary of the NAACP highlighted the need for federal intervention where state laws and state courts refused or failed to protect the constitutional rights of Blacks. White was not a lawyer, but as an official in the NAACP his presence at the convention was an important one. Mr. White stated that the NAACP's "next step will be a step further in giving federal courts the right to give redress when the state courts and the state itself do not take steps to give that redress." Id. at 74.

Several other important speeches were delivered during the 1932 meeting in Indianapolis. Mr. C. Frances Stradford [Chicago, Illinois] delivered an important paper entitled "Social Unrest and The Law," and Freeman L. Martin delivered a paper on the subject of "How To Stay In Court." Also in attendance and constantly mentioned in various speeches was Dr. Charles Hamilton Houston, Dean of the Howard University School of Law, who spoke on "The Effect of the Program Inaugurated for Lawful Enforcement of Law." And, highlighting the discrimination by the federal government, Thomas Campbell from Denver, Colorado gave a strong paper entitled, "Governmental Policy Regarding Employment at The Hoover Dam."

Women have always played a significant role in the Afro-American Bar—and so it was in Indianapolis in 1932. Two women were very influential during the convention; namely, Ms. Ollie May Cooper of Washington, D.C., the National Assistant Secretary of the NBA,⁴ and Georgia Jones Ellis, of Chicago, Illinois, who delivered a significant paper entitled, "The Necessity of Universal Suffrage." And, I believe that H. Elsie Austin, who I have previously mentioned, and Bee Longwood were two of the few Black women lawyers in Indianapolis during the 1932 Convention.

Ms. H. Elsie Austin is a unique woman who has made a significant contribution to the law and to humankind itself. In 1930 Ms. Austin was graduated from the University of Cincinnati, College of Law. She is the first black woman graduate of this law school. From 1937-1939, she served as Assistant Attorney General in the state of Ohio and is the first black woman lawyer in the history of the nation to hold this position.

⁴ See J. Clay Smith, Jr., Ollie May Cooper: "The Real Dean of Howard University School of Law," 20 *How. L.J.* 368 (1980); Note, Ollie Cooper, 94 *Dies*; Taught Law at Howard U., *Washington Post*, Col. 3, B5, April 17, 1981.

Also, Ms. Austin was elected as National Vice-President of the National Bar Association circa 1937. Presently, she resides in Washington, D.C. and sends her personal regards to the Marion County Bar Association.

In conclusion, you invited me to come to Indianapolis to discuss the role of the Black lawyer in the 1980's. Your role as Afro-American lawyers, your mission as Afro-American lawyers, your commitment as Afro-American lawyers, and your role as the now Marion County Bar Association is no different today than in 1932. The Marion County Bar Association must continue to assert its energy for the eradication of discrimination in the American workforce. You must take your stand on the principles undergirding affirmative action. In the tradition of two of your outstanding members—Howard Hooper and Mercer M. Marice, this association must seek, find and secure justice and knock on the doors of injustice and callousness which restricts equal opportunity—whether economic or employment affecting Black Americans.

I accepted the invitation of the Marion County Bar Association because of your history in America and because of your sustained desire to rid America of race distinctions and discrimination.

The Marion County Bar Association is important to me as a citizen of the United States and as Chairman of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

To my knowledge, it has been a half century since the NBA held a convention in this city. The United States is indebted to the Marion County Lawyers Club (Association) for fifty-six years of leadership in the county, the city of Indianapolis, the state of Indiana and in the nation. I am happy that I have been able to articulate themes of the 1930's that laid the foundation for your banquet theme—The Role of Black Lawyers in the 1980's. ●

AVERELL HARRIMAN

● Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, one of the most distinguished public servants in the history of the United States, Averell Harriman, recently celebrated his 90th birthday. That milestone has received considerable attention and properly so. Few Americans, in the two centuries this Government has existed, have contributed more to the cause of peace and good will than Mr. Harriman.

Averell Harriman stands as a model of public service. As Governor, Ambassador, Cabinet member, and in other public offices, he has contributed significantly to our development as a nation and as a power in the modern world.

His influence, however, extends far beyond official records, and his spirit, his commitment, and his willingness to give time and talent have inspired men and women in this country and around the world.

The Washington Post of November 14, 1981, contained a column by Philip Geyelin on the remarkable Averell Harriman. Mr. President, I ask that this be placed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

AVERELL HARRIMAN: A GIANT

(By Philip Geyelin)

It was August 13, 1950. W. Averell Harriman was returning home from one more delicate mission—as President Truman's emissary to General Douglas MacArthur. He was about to take up another dicey piece of business as Truman's foreign policy coordinator. Reporting in a late evening "newsmakers"

broadcast, Walter Cronkite had this to say of the former almost-everything in American politics and diplomacy whose 90th birthday tomorrow was dedicated this week, at a fundraising dinner, to the fortunes (material as well as political) of his beloved Democratic Party:

"Harriman could have been a playboy. He was born with a \$70,000,000 silver spoon in his mouth . . . went to Groton and Yale . . . [then] into banking, became an eight-goal polo player, even developed a sort of upper-class stoop, a slight bow to boredom. But this millionaire was made of considerably sterner stuff. . . . Today Harriman seems to be a man devoted solely to selfless service to his country."

"Selfless service"—it sounds smarmy, unless you happen to be fed up to here with the rancid condition of American statescraft as it comes across these days: the obsession with "turf"; the "guerrilla warfare"; the who's-up-who's-down - who's - on-the-skids speculations of breathless analysts. Against the backdrop, a review of the record of Averell Harriman shines bright as a timely reminder to today's pushers and shovers of the purposes they are supposed to be serving—of what public service, at its best, is all about.

What it was all about, in Averell Harriman's case, was almost a half-century of reflexive, fire-horse pawing and champing at the fire bell's first ring. When Cronkite spoke of a "tall, stooped, unsmiling man who wearily climbed down from the big Constellation at Washington's National Airport," Harriman was 59 at that time and "wearily" was apparently the operative word. The way people talked about him 31 years ago made Harriman sound sometimes like a prime candidate for early retirement.

New York Times columnist C. L. Sulzberger, in an album of memoirs entitled "A Long Row of Candles," offered these snapshots of that period: "When Averell came in, he looked ghastly. He is visibly overtired and thin . . . [and on another occasion] He looks tired and worn . . . [and on another] He really looked bushed . . . [and again] He looked poorly and has a tic in his eye . . . [and in 1951] Last week he worked straight through from 8 a.m. until 7 a.m. the following morning. That's too much for a man of sixty."

As it turned out, it wasn't. He had already served two presidents over 17 years: Franklin D. Roosevelt, as New Deal manager, lend-lease coordinator in London, wartime ambassador in Moscow; and Harry Truman as promoter and roving ambassador for the Marshall Plan. Still ahead was a mind-boggling succession of jobs: ambassador to London, secretary of commerce, nuclear test ban negotiator, undersecretary of state, Vietnam peace negotiator, and a half-dozen special presidential missions—not to mention governor of New York.

He voted for Al Smith in 1928 and became a Democrat for life because he was "very disturbed by the fallacies of the Republican Party, both domestic and foreign," he explained in a long conversation the other day. "I am just about always disturbed about something—you have to be."

He says he "can't get as excited about some things as I used to when I could put on a hat and do something about it." But when I called on him, he was hunched up, inches away from his television set. Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin was holding forth on ABC's "Issues and Answers," and if Harriman wasn't excited, his muttering suggested that he was, let's say, disturbed.

He was also philosophical. "Every situation always looks the worst it's ever been," he replied, when asked about the current international scene. "But these questions get solved because they have to be solved."

Does the man who dealt with Roosevelt

and Churchill and Stalin subscribe to the theory that these men were giants—and that there are no giants on the contemporary stage? "History makes them giants, because what they do becomes important," is his answer. "But they are not giants when they do it—there will always be somebody around to do what's needed."

Without vanity but by way of illustration, he recalls that "everybody thought I was crazy" to accept a comedown from undersecretary of state to assistant secretary in the 1960's. "But it didn't bother me, because I knew I had a job to do. When something needed doing, I usually started to do something about it." He doesn't think that's unique—"there are many Americans who can do something about these things."

He's probably right. But there are not many—or at least not all that many now in action—who fit the test of selfless service set down by George Kennan, Harriman's No. 2 man in Moscow in the war years. In his "Memoirs" in 1967, Kennan wrote of Harriman:

"No diplomatist ever executed more punctiliously [his] instructions. . . . None—be it said to his eternal credit—was ever less inclined to distort the record however imperceptibly, in order to show himself and his performance off to good advantage. . . . The United States has never had a more faithful public servant." ●

ADDITIONAL LAND FOR THE TRUSTOM POND REFUGE IN RHODE ISLAND

● Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, in reviewing the Interior Appropriations bill, I am reminded of the fine effort put forth by Senator JOHN CHAFFEE in the effort to provide Federal funding for the purchase of additional land for the Trustom Pond Refuge in Rhode Island.

This acquisition is crucial not only to Rhode Island and New England, but also to the United States as a whole. We need to reserve precious pieces of land such as the Trustom Pond area for future generations to enjoy and for the protection of those fish and wildlife species which need these areas for their continued survival.

Mr. President, I would like to request that an article from the Narragansett Times, which illustrates the importance of this appropriation, be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Narragansett Times, Nov. 5, 1981]

SEN. CHAFFEE TO THE RESCUE: TRUSTOM EXPANSION SQUEAKS BY
(By Craig N. Berke)

A joint Congressional committee yesterday approved \$440,000 for the purchase of 60 acres of privately owned land to expand the boundaries of the Trustom Pond National Wildlife Refuge in South Kingstown.

The committee approval means that the appropriation is almost certain to be included in the U.S. Interior Department's land and water conservation budget that will be passed along to President Reagan.

Hope for the acquisition dwindled briefly yesterday, however, when the joint House-Senate conference committee killed the funding.

Members of the House earlier this year had approved \$591,000 to purchase land adjacent to Trustom. But Senate members of the committee balked at the amount, and the House members gave up during caucus yesterday morning in Washington, D.C.

But when Rhode Island Sen. John H. Chafee, a strong backer of the Trustum package, heard that news, he marched over to the conference with aide Robert Hurley. The Republican senator pulled off some political wizardry, persuading Senate members of the committee to restore \$440,000, the amount needed to buy the 60 acres owned by Joseph J. Young, Jr.

Because of rising property taxes, Mr. Young had threatened to sell his land for residential development if the Senate didn't allocate funds for the purchase this year. Mr. Young, an Arlington, Va., resident, repeatedly has lobbied for the federal purchase, wanting to keep his South Kingstown land undeveloped.

"It was like raising Lazarus from the dead," Mr. Young said of the Congressional action in a telephone interview from Washington yesterday. "At 9:30, it was a dead turkey, and at 12:30 it was alive again. I had left that meeting thinking it was a completely dead duck. An hour later, the action had been reversed. It was amazing."

The conference committee's report goes back to both houses for approval, before the budget goes to the President.

Congresswoman Claudine Schneider, who helped push for the original \$591,000 approval in the House, said last night she was "thrilled we got at least \$440,000." Noting the temporary death of the funding yesterday, Mrs. Schneider observed that "the Senate was not tuned in to this project at all" until Senator Chafee made his pitch.

Mr. Young's sale to the federal government would average \$7,300 an acre, seemingly a bargain when one considers it had already been planned for development of prime shoreline homesites.

The appropriation was preceded by the August approval by the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife of the long-range plan to expand the 365-acre Trustum Pond refuge to about 965 acres.

Fish and Wildlife officials have said their first priority was purchasing Mr. Young's 60 acres.

The Rhode Island Audubon Society, upon learning of the government land acquisition plan, pledged to donate its 115-acre preserve on the east shore of Trustum Pond to the national wildlife refuge.

That leaves about 425 acres the federal government would still like to purchase outright, or at least secure their development rights, leaving them as open space. It has been estimated that \$1.25 million would be needed to complete the purchase of the acreage surrounding the current boundaries.

"This is an extraordinarily important thing for the state and southeastern New England," Mr. Young said. "The prospect of having nearly 1,000 acres on the ocean, including one-and-a-half miles of ocean beach, is just marvelous."

The Trustum Pond area is a pristine wilderness adjacent to Moonstone Beach, which, other than a few family residences and farms, has been untouched since before the American Revolution. Alfred L. Hawkes, executive director of the state Audubon Society, calls it "one of the prettiest areas on the coast."

In January, when Mr. Young announced plans to develop as many as 100 house lots on his property, a local conservation group called Friends of Trustum Pond formed to try to save the unspoiled nature of the area.

The group mobilized local support, writing members of the state's Congressional delegation and getting the South Kingstown Town Council to renew a resolution to keep the area development-free.

Mr. Young said he is pleased with all Congressional representatives who played a role in the funding project, and described it as "a marvelous thing to see."

Mr. Young pointed out that between potential federal and state purchases in the Matunuck and Moonstone areas, as many as 2,000 acres may be preserved for open space.

If outright purchases are not possible, the next best thing may be securing the development rights, according to a regional spokesman for the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Under such a plan, the government would pay the landowner half the property's value. The landowner would still hold title to the land, and would be permitted to maintain a residence on it. The owner also could use the land for anything other than new residential, commercial or industrial purposes. Permitted uses would include agriculture, hunting, trapping or fishing. ●

DR. LORING HART

(At the request of Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD:)

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, like all Vermonters, I applaud the dedication and excellence shown by Dr. Loring Hart during his tenure as president of Norwich University. Norwich University is the Nation's oldest private military college, and one of the Nation's finest. Dr. Hart's own service is complete within the tradition expected by this fine university.

I ask that an article about Dr. Hart from the Sunday Rutland Herald and the Sunday Times Argus, October 25, 1981, of Vermont be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

HART BROUGHT SCHOOL INTO STEP WITH TIMES IN 10 YEARS AT HELM

NORTHFIELD.—Dr. Loring Hart is leaving his post as president of Norwich University in June, culminating a decade-long reign at the nation's oldest private military college. The school will not be long without him, though. Hart plans a return to the Northfield campus a year after he delivers his last commencement address at the school's 21st president.

The 56-year-old former English teacher might return to the Norwich classrooms; he has named that as one option after a planned 12-month sabbatical, or perhaps help in fundraising efforts for the university.

He leaves not the same homogenous military-oriented school he inherited in 1972 but a school so changed that founder Alden Partridge might not recognize it.

"The essential nature of the school up until about 1970 had remained virtually unchanged since 1819" when it was founded, says the gray-haired career educator.

When Hart took control of the school, it was an all-male, traditional college firmly rooted in the past. What the next president will run is a co-educational university with two campuses as different as day and night that costs \$20 million to operate annually. The new president will find his administration is rushing headlong into an uncertain future, hustling to keep enrollment up and stretching curricula and development dollars to the limit.

Hart has naturally been given much of the credit for the school's metamorphosis during the past 10 years. He is generous, however, in passing around the plaudits. Hart believes his tenure has been successful largely because he made it his policy of including others in decisions. Says Hart: "I try never to make unadvised decisions."

It was a policy that endured from the beginning.

Hart's association with Norwich began in 1957, seven years after he graduated from Bowdoin College in Maine. He signed on as

an English teacher and soon rose to department chairman. By 1968 he was, by his own admission, a dean and vice president "very much involved in things." In 1972, at the age of 46, he succeeded Barksdale Hamlett as president.

It was an unsteady time for Norwich. The anti-war sentiment of the Vietnam era was running high. The cadet population had fallen to fewer than 1,000. In a precedent-setting move, Hart orchestrated the 1972 merger with Vermont College. The private school was then in financial debt.

"It was considered to be a finishing school for debutantes," Hart remembers, recalling that enrollment had fallen significantly at the small two-year college.

The merger was the first of many steps Hart says were not intended to break traditions, but rather to bring Norwich into a more modern age.

"The need for change" to co-education, says Hart, "was inevitable."

"We thought we could maintain two campuses: one in Northfield, male and military and one in Montpelier, civilian and for women."

He got more than he bargained for. The impact of the merger was heavy and irreversible.

"Within two months women were demanding to live in these barracks, and their parents were demanding it," says Hart.

By 1974 the tide had turned completely. A 155-year-old barrier was broken and a handful of the women who had requested to live on the Norwich campus signed into the Corps of Cadets. Not until a year later would women be enrolled in federal service academies like West Point and Annapolis.

Hart's simple conclusion is that women have changed the very fabric of life for cadets. Those who before sought comfort in the familiar cloak of fraternity suddenly found themselves competing on every level with women.

Things were quite difficult for the first female cadets but they endured.

"They strengthened every aspect of university life," Hart recalls. At a time when military life was scorned, the admission of women gave Norwich "a sense of modernity . . . that we were with it."

There were other changes. The energy crisis of the mid-1970s played havoc with the school's budget and Norwich faced a deficit of about \$750,000. Under Hart's leadership the school began a multi-faceted program designed to diversify the curriculum, raise capital and fill the empty beds on both campuses.

"We knew that if we didn't restore the campuses to capacity we would face major deficits," he says.

Hart proudly points out that the school's most successful development campaign ever pulled in \$8 million. The curriculum was broadened and the faculty upgraded. The grand plans, guided by the raspy-voiced president who brought all the pieces together, eventually worked. This fall the freshman "rooks" were crammed three to a room. Enrollment at VC was near capacity. In their neat, carpeted offices admissions personnel had to be smiling just a little.

One episode stands apart from all others in this decade, though. Foreign students had been attending Norwich throughout the 20th century, but never so many as had come from Iran. The numbers grew and peaked in 1979 when 139 cadets enrolled at Norwich were receiving paychecks from the Imperial Navy of Iran.

Hart remembers the Iranian revolution and the hostage crisis as times of "great upheaval." But he says there were never political problems between Iranian cadets and their American counterparts.

He remembers making hasty arrangements

for the 85 Iranian cadets to leave in April 1980 when then-President Jimmy Carter ordered all Iranian government employees out of the U.S.

Though he sympathized with the young men, emotion can go just so far in the military, Hart says: "As young people I would have liked to see them stay and finish their educations. As officers of the Imperial Iranian Navy I wanted them to leave."

The summer's commencement exercises helped relieve some of the sadness brought about by the Iranian episode. But right behind it were stirrings of another issue—a rumored takeover of programs from financially ailing Goddard College.

The Plainfield school and Norwich eventually reached agreement for the university to take over four adult degree programs. But it was a hard road. Hart says that both college communities were misled by media reports of negotiations for transfer of the programs, and dismisses as "all nonsense" rumors at the time that the two schools considered merging.

He strongly denies Norwich ever "bought" programs: "We bought nothing from Goddard College. It had nothing to do with buying a program. I don't know how you would put a price on a program. We paid a transfer fee for records."

Even in the twilight of his tenure Hart still puts in those long days. He is in his office by 8:30 a.m. and the testimonial dinners sometimes last past midnight. He will not miss the travel or the late nights out on the road. Over the years he has visited dozens of cities, attended hundreds of fundraising events of all kinds, shaken the hands of thousands of alumni. It has been a far cry from his school days when college presidents "walked around the campus, taught a class, smoked their pipes and commented on the events of the day."

Those days are, of course, gone. College presidents today are money-making technicians, public relations whiz kids. Teaching, perhaps sadly, is too often an extracurricular activity for them now.

But Loring Hart is cut from another mold. Ironically enough, like MacArthur, he promises he'll be back. ●

NOMINATION OF ELLIOTT ABRAMS

● Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, today the Committee on Foreign Relations heard the testimony of Elliott Abrams, whom the President has nominated to serve as the Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs. Mr. Abrams was warmly welcomed by the members of the committee, and his nomination was approved by a unanimous and bipartisan vote.

Mr. President, the Reagan administration has consistently espoused the fundamental rule of liberty in the conduct of our Nation's foreign policy. In nominating Mr. Abrams for this sensitive post, the President has given this young man a unique opportunity to articulate to the world the true character of the issues at stake in discussions about "human rights" throughout the world. The human rights debate is fundamentally a battle of ideas, Mr. President, and Mr. Abrams appears to be a man whose education and experience equip him well to carry on a forceful and persuasive articulation of the truth about the human rights.

I am often saddened by the remarkable consistency with which many so-called

human rights arguments are made in favor of regimes and movements whose ultimate goal and historical practice consists in the revolutionary subjugation of a people to tyrannical rule by a narrow ideological party. It seems that some people will go to any extreme to defend leftist subversion, terrorism, and revolution anywhere in the world. They believe that no government is just unless it is Marxist. They believe that private property is "oppression." They believe that the family is an "obstacle to progress." They believe that religious faith is "the opiate of the masses."

The President, the substance of the human rights discussions normally reported in the international media is all too often polluted with these suppositions, however nicely disguised by legalisms and technical jargon. It is intellectually fashionable in many quarters these days to demean the family, to attack private property, to belittle religious faith, and to constantly heap abuse upon the values and traditions of our free Nation, while embracing unquestionably the most brutal of suppressions, so long as it promises, starry-eyed, the ideological deliverance of the people to a revolutionary utopia.

We all know where such revolution is coming from: The centers of export for totalitarian revolution around the world are common knowledge. North Korea has its agents in Latin America and Africa; Libya sends assassins to eliminate its enemies around the world; and Havana, Moscow, East Berlin and Peking all harmonize in the revolutionary symphony.

We must recall that, in the case of Argentina, of El Salvador, and of many other trouble spots in the world, it is precisely these revolutionary provocateurs who create the climate in which human rights violations are most likely to take place. Once the revolutionary insurgents have begun, their leftist allies in the propaganda network around the world begin to beat the drum about human rights violations, but always limit themselves to criticism of governments, not insurgents.

Those governments which they attack are usually those who are allied with the United States in opposition to Soviet imperialism—to call it by its proper name. It is my hope that what many perceive to be a vacuum in the human rights dialog, the lack of criticism of leftist governments and the revolutionary terrorists they support around the world, will be eliminated by a sober, informed and consistent balance in our approach to human rights.

Mr. Abrams has a unique opportunity as the administration's "point man" in matters concerning human rights; to expose the fallacies of the arguments which seek to dignify totalitarianism. Mr. President, the battle is one of ideas. As Solzhenitsyn has written, and as he told me himself in reference to Russia, his homeland, the enemy is falsehood, and it inevitably brings violence in its wake. I wish Elliott Abrams much fortitude and perseverance in the task that awaits him. ●

A REGION OF INSECURITY U.S. INDIFFERENCE, SOVIET BUILDUP CREATE NEW DANGERS IN ASIA

● Mr. HAYAKAWA. Mr. President, the presence of the Soviet Fleet on all the world's oceans, the impressive military technology of the Soviet Union, and its aggressive shipbuilding program all provide conclusive evidence that Moscow looks to the oceans as a way of expanding its worldwide influence and military power.

The growth of Soviet armed strength in East Asia far beyond the U.S.S.R.'s own defensive needs is particularly troubling. Some of the world's most important sealanes pass through the area and is a major source of strategic raw materials for the free world.

"The United States ignores security matters in East Asia at its own risk," conclude David Fitzgerald and Michael Moodie in a September Sea Power Magazine article entitled "A Region of Insecurity: U.S. Indifference, Soviet Buildup Create New Dangers in Asia."

In recent years Moscow has built up its forces both quantitatively and qualitatively. It now has 44 divisions in Asia, totaling between 300,000 and 400,000 personnel. Most of these forces are deployed against China but there is a parallel buildup of between 10,000 and 12,000 men in the Kurile Islands north of Japan. Moscow has nearly 2,000 aircraft stationed in the Far East and about one-third of its submarine force. The Soviet Fleet is now deployed to the point where it could dominate the Pacific sealanes and, if it chose, blockade them. Also, the sealanes of the Western Pacific have been further endangered by recent Soviet access to Vietnam's naval base at Cam Ranh Bay, thereby increasing the mobility of the Soviet Pacific Fleet and simultaneously extending its reach.

The United States cannot ignore the Soviet threat to the sealanes of the western Pacific. Japan imports 75 percent of its oil through these avenues. Australia, the Philippines and the ASEAN states—Association of Southeast Asian Nations—depend on seaborne trade to maintain their dynamic economies. And most importantly, the United States imports large quantities of titanium, zirconium, rubber, tin, and tungsten from east Asia.

As Fitzgerald and Moodie note:

In pursuing its interests and responding to developments in Pacific Asia, the United States will have to draw upon the full panoply of policy instruments at its disposal. Clearly, one of the most important of these instruments is the Navy... The big problem, of course, is one of numbers.

I wholeheartedly share the concerns of Messrs. Fitzgerald and Moodie about the increasingly uneasy security situation in the Asian Pacific region and our ability to respond. In 1964 our fleet numbered 917 active ships. It is now only 460. During the same period of time, the number of combat ships has declined from 440 to 310. Given the present world situation and the increased Soviet naval capabilities, our efforts to reverse that trend must continue.

Mr. President, Messrs. Fitzgerald and Moodie have written a thoughtful and timely article. I commend it to my colleagues and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

A REGION OF INSECURITY: U.S. INDIFFERENCE, SOVIET BUILDUP CREATE NEW DANGERS IN ASIA
(By David Fitzgerald and Michael Moodie)

With the end of the Vietnam War, American defense planners turned their eyes away from the restless Asian littoral of the Pacific. Out of inclination, the Carter administration initially gave almost exclusive priority to the defense of Western Europe. Out of necessity, it was forced to focus on the Persian Gulf. As a consequence, little attention has been given to Asian security.

But to continue the previous policy of benign neglect would be a serious mistake.

The United States ignores security matters in East Asia at its own great risk. U.S. interests in the area are large, complex, and increasing. Some of the world's most important sea lanes pass through the region, carrying vital commodities not only to the United States but to key friends and allies such as Japan, the Philippines, and Australia. The region also constitutes a large reservoir of raw materials, most of which are in short supply in the industrial democracies. The United States itself imports large quantities of titanium, zirconium, rubber, tin, and tungsten from East Asia.

The continued economic vitality of the area is a further U.S. concern. Economically, the Pacific Basin is one of the most dynamic regions of the world, reflecting a rate of annual economic growth well above the world average. Japan and the members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), moreover, are among America's most important trading partners. Several of them also play a key regional role in the U.S. global security system, and would provide facilities, forces, and funds for a joint defense effort to confront commonly perceived naval and military threats.

Given those and other important American interests in the Asian-Pacific region, the United States has no choice but to respond to the increasingly uneasy security situation in the area. Problems already developing at a rapid rate in East Asia would have a particularly important impact on the U.S. Navy because they might well affect adversely, the forces available to the Navy to carry out its missions elsewhere in the world. Noted Asian scholar Robert Scalapino, writing in *Foreign Affairs*, suggested the twin hallmarks of the Asian scene today are "fragility and fluidity."

Two new geopolitical factors that threaten to disrupt Asia's fragile, fluid balance of power are the growth of Soviet naval and military forces in the area and increased domestic and regional political instability that could erupt into conflict at almost any time.

QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE BUILDUP

The growth of Soviet armed strength in Asia far beyond the USSR's own defense needs troubles many states in the area. In recent years Moscow has built up its forces in the Soviet Far East both quantitatively and qualitatively. Since the deterioration of Sino-Soviet relations, which almost came to a head during the 1969 border tensions, the Soviet Union has stationed about 44 divisions in Asia, totaling between 300,000 and 400,000 combat personnel. Included in that total are several armored divisions equipped with T-62 tanks and BM-21 rocket launchers. These forces are without question deployed against China. Because of the long-term buildup, more recent qualitative force improvements, such as the introduction of new tank units, have not generated excessive concern in most Asia capitals (other than Peking itself).

What is more worrisome to U.S. friends in the area, especially the Japanese, is the parallel Soviet buildup of forces in the Kurile Islands north of Japan. According to officials of the Japanese Defense Agency quoted in the 10 January 1980 issue of *Aviation Week and Space Technology*, there is in the Kuriles a nucleus of 10,000 to 12,000 men—a force which could easily be expanded to division size, and already equipped with MI-24 Hind D helicopters and heavy artillery.

Soviet military exercises on the Kuriles within sight of Japan's northernmost island of Hokkaido also have upset the Japanese. Such Soviet actions provide a handy defensive screen behind which Moscow could convert the Sea of Okhotsk and its approaches into a Soviet preserve.

Moscow also has nearly 2,000 aircraft stationed in the Far East. Included in the total are MiG-23, -25, and -27 fighters, a variety of transports, and TU-16 Badger, TU-95 Bear, and Backfire bombers.

While the Soviet ground and air buildup in the Far East is sobering, it is the growth of Soviet naval power in the region that generates the most intense concern. According to Stuart Johnson and Joseph Yager of the Brookings Institution, two trends characterize recent Soviet developments in the Far East: fleet modernization and a growing emphasis on antisubmarine warfare (ASW). About one-third of Moscow's submarine force, including Delta 2 ballistic missile submarines in the Sea of Okhotsk, now operates in the Pacific. Kresta-class cruisers and Krivak-class destroyers form the backbone of the surface fleet. The introduction of such first-line ships into the Soviet Pacific Fleet has of course greatly increased Moscow's capability to operate over longer ranges and for longer periods of time.

The arrival of the ASW carrier Minsk and its escorts in early 1979 substantially enhanced the already formidable capabilities of the Soviet Pacific Fleet. In all, the new ships assigned in recent years added 800,000 tons to the fleet and brought its total number to over 750 vessels. The Minsk can carry 30 to 35 aircraft, depending on the specific mix of V/STOL (vertical/short takeoff and landing) fighters and helicopters carried. Another important addition to the fleet has been the modern LPD (amphibious transport dock) Ivan Rogov, which gives the USSR an amphibious capability in the region for the first time.

In addition to fighting ships, the USSR operates intelligence ships almost constantly in the waters around Japan, and Soviet intelligence and reconnaissance aircraft frequently skirt Japanese airspace.

The threat generated by growing Soviet power in the Western Pacific is obvious. The Japanese are particularly concerned that the introduction of new amphibious capabilities heightens the danger that the Soviet Union will be able to launch a direct attack against Japan. The Japanese newspaper *Sankai* reported a Japanese Defense Agency assessment:

"If hovercraft are used it will be possible to land in Hokkaido within a little less than 20 minutes [from Soviet-occupied Kunashiri]. It means that Japan has been put into the situation where a dagger has been thrust at its throat."

The Japanese recognize, of course, that such Soviet action is most unlikely except in the context of a general breakdown of East-West relations.

A POTENTIAL FOR BLOCKADE

However, Japan shares a broader concern with all U.S. friends and allies in the region—namely, that the Soviet fleet now has developed to the point where it could dominate the Pacific sea lanes. Japan imports 75% of its oil from the Middle East. That oil

must pass through the Malaccan, Lombok, and Sunda Straits, to say nothing of the constricted sea lanes around Japan itself, to get to Japan. The dynamic economies of the Asian states depend on seaborne trade traversing those same sea lanes.

There is now a real fear, therefore, that the Soviet Union could blockade those sea lanes. That fear is not diminished by reports which have circulated that Moscow has stationed submarines, armed with cruise missiles, in the vicinity of the Straits of Malacca where they would be in position to sink allied shipping in the event of hostilities.

The Soviet threat to the sea lanes of the Western Pacific has been exacerbated by a further development favorable to Moscow: Soviet access to Vietnam's naval base at Cam Ranh Bay. The importance of the base would be difficult to overestimate. First, it is close to the Straits of Malacca, Lombok, and Sunda. Second, its use brings Soviet military forces closer to the largest U.S. naval facility in the region, at Subic Bay in the Philippines. Third, it provides a convenient base for both ship and aircraft surveillance activities. Finally, and perhaps most important, access to Cam Ranh Bay greatly increases the mobility of the Soviet Pacific fleet, at the same time it extends its reach. Perhaps the fleet's most serious disadvantage is the geographic difficulty it faces in operating out of its bases in Soviet Asia at Vladivostok and on the Kamchatka Peninsula. With the exception of Petropavlovsk, the Soviet ports are icebound several months each year. To reach the high seas, vessels operating from those ports must transit the choke points of Japan's Soya, Tsugaru, and Tsushima Straits. Moreover, Vladivostok is far distant from the most probable centers of Soviet naval activity in the Indian Ocean and South Pacific. Cam Ranh Bay, 1,000 miles south of Vladivostok, alleviates most of these shortcomings.

The potential threat inherent in growing Soviet power in Pacific Asia is not only military; there is a political dimension as well. In crises short of actual conflict, Soviet threats to shipping in the area could, if the Kremlin so decided, raise the cost of trade by driving up insurance rates or forcing merchant ships to take safer routes (south around Australia, for example) that are longer, more time consuming, and thus more costly. The Soviets thus could apply very heavy pressure on regional economies.

More important, the perception among Asian leaders of unchecked Soviet power in the region could make those decisionmakers more accommodating to Moscow's policies. Any such development would be particularly disturbing if the need to accommodate were strongly felt in Peking and/or Tokyo.

THREATS TO REGIONAL PEACE

The second major threat to U.S. interests in the Pacific Basin is the increasing regional instability flowing from historical regional rivalries, more recent domestic discontent, or lagging economic performance. The instability problem is most acute in Southeast Asia, although the still unsettled state of affairs on the Korean peninsula also could lead to a conflict situation. In South Korea domestic political difficulties pose an ominous threat; instability could well be the pretext for renewed aggression from the north.

Widespread conflict in Southeast Asia also could jeopardize the economic advances made by many of the region's non-Communist states. The biggest immediate problem is Vietnam, whose aggressiveness disturbs all states in the region. The threat of further fighting in Indochina remains high, although the level of tension in the area diminished somewhat during the past year. Conflict nevertheless continues in Cambodia, Thailand faces steady pressures against its border,

and Mainland China remains unhappy with the present stalemate. Given such tension and turmoil, prospects for stability are not high.

Regional stability could be further upset by domestic upheaval in, and/or internal challenges to, some Southeast Asian regimes. A common problem plaguing many of these countries is political strife stemming from racial, religious, or regional differences among their heterogeneous populations. The Philippines, for example, has been the scene of growing domestic political opposition to the Marcos regime—opposition marked, moreover, by increasing violence such as bombings last year in Manila, and the ongoing rebellions of Communists and Moslems. Discontent in Indonesia also has been on the rise, and both Malaysia and Thailand are facing domestic difficulties.

Such problems seriously hamper the ability of governments in the region to respond to external challenges and, at the same time, build an improved political and social infrastructure. Worse, instability virtually invites outside involvement. There is, consequently, a continuing potential for superpower confrontations. The fact that Moscow, Washington, Peking, and Tokyo are all keenly interested in Pacific Asian developments suggests an intricate, constantly changing minuet among those powers and, if confrontation is to be avoided, a degree of accommodation not always present.

A SYNERGISM OF CONCERN

Clearly, both trends—the growth of Soviet military power in Asia and increasing regional instability—are major concerns to American policymakers. U.S. problems in the area, moreover, are made even more difficult by the interaction of these trends. Regional instability, whether the result of conflict between states or violence within a given Asian nation, creates opportunities for an external actor with the power, and the will to exercise that power, to become involved.

In Asia today, that external actor is the Soviet Union. In the wake of Vietnam, there exists a strong perception that the United States has not been able to match long-term Soviet gains in Asia. The Soviet bid for hegemony in Asia, while perhaps less direct than in other regions of the world, is not seen to be countered by gun-shy America. That perception could change, of course, under the Reagan Administration, particularly since the Sidra Gulf incident. But the Sidra incident involved a direct attack against American aircraft; whether the same U.S. response is likely elsewhere, under less direct provocation, has yet to be determined. Domestic violence and regional conflict in Asia create further fears in the region that Moscow will try to exploit such problems while the United States sits idly by.

If the United States is to maintain its influence and support its clear national interests in Asia it must therefore be willing to demonstrate a strong national commitment to peace and security in the area. Such commitment must be made, moreover, within the context of a coherent foreign policy which to date has, in the opinion of some analysts, not yet been fully enunciated. In any case, there are important implications for the U.S. Navy.

A CRISIS OF NUMBERS

In pursuing its interests and responding to developments in Pacific Asia, the United States will have to draw upon the full panoply of policy instruments at its disposal. Clearly, one of the most important of those instruments is the Navy. As they have in the past, decisionmakers in Washington will undoubtedly, therefore, call upon the Navy—there really is no viable alternative—to support American interests across a wide range of geopolitical scenarios.

The impact of developments in eastern Asia on the role of the U.S. Navy must be viewed in three distinct contexts: wartime,

crisis, and peacetime. In a general war situation the U.S. Navy in the Pacific would have three major missions. Optimally, it would bottle up the Soviet fleet in port. Second, it would have to maintain the security of the important sea lanes. Third, it would have to be ready to support land operations in the region as and wherever required.

But there are serious difficulties which could impede accomplishment of each of these wartime tasks. The big problem, of course, is one of numbers. The deployment of a U.S. carrier task force from the Seventh Fleet to the Indian Ocean has already demonstrated the great pressures that could be imposed on U.S. naval operations in the Pacific if a near-term conflict were global in scope. Since any shooting confrontation with the Soviet Union is likely to be worldwide, there is a serious question whether the U.S. Navy in the Pacific has the capability to adequately perform all of its wartime missions.

During a less-than-wartime crisis in the Pacific, whether directly involving the Soviet Union or not, the U.S. Navy's tasks would be: first, when and if appropriate, to exert political pressure, through asserting a naval presence in the area of crisis, for favorable resolution of the problem; and second, to offset any similar moves the Soviet Union might make with its own Pacific Fleet. (One example: the U.S. Navy might be dispatched to the chokepoints around Indonesia to prevent the Soviet Union from exerting uncontested pressure by threatening to close the straits.)

In their excellent Brookings study, "Force Without War," Barry Blechman and Stephen S. Kaplan identify the difficulties always facing decisionmakers who use naval power as an instrument of political influence. The omnipresent problems cited are made even more difficult today with the growth of the Soviet navy, which now, for the first time, poses a global obstacle to the unhampered use of American naval forces. Moreover, the increasing sophistication of the non-aligned states in Asia, and throughout the Third World, about the use of naval power as a political instrument, as well as the buildup of regional navies, may make them less susceptible in any case to friendly U.S. naval pressure. (Soviet naval pressure, less friendly, might for that reason be more successful.)

MUSCULAR PRESENCE

The peacetime role of the U.S. Navy in the Pacific is, simply, to promote stability and provide to America's friends and allies an overt, and muscular, symbol of the U.S. commitment to regional progress and development. The impact of the U.S. naval presence in the Western Pacific thus is as much psychological as it is political or military—as was well demonstrated by the consternation exhibited by U.S. friends in the region when, as mentioned earlier, the United States denuded the Seventh Fleet in order to send vessels to the Indian Ocean after the fall of the Shah of Iran and seizure of the American embassy in Tehran. An earlier example is the uproar that occurred after the U.S. "swing strategy"—calling for the shift of naval/military assets from the Pacific to the Atlantic in event of conflict with the Soviet Union—was publicized.

The Navy is not, of course, the only policy instrument on which American decisionmakers must rely in peacetime to promote regional stability in Pacific Asia. In fact, it is not, and should not be considered, the primary instrument. Rather, naval forces play a supporting role to political, economic, and diplomatic policies. Symbols of strength which certainly no hostile nation can safely ignore, they nevertheless should be used sparingly.

THE SUBIC IMPERATIVE

Obviously, whether during peacetime, in a crisis situation, or in time of war, the successful exploitation of naval forces in the

Western Pacific depends in large part on those forces being on the scene—particularly since the sprawling geography of the area, as well as present military trends, demand immediate response if naval forces, or any other, are to be effective. That response can be timely only if naval forces are positioned in strength in the region on a continuing basis. And the factors determining a continuing presence are the number of ships in the fleet and the availability of support facilities.

For that reason alone, continued U.S. access to the Subic Bay naval base is extremely important. Were the U.S. Navy forced to leave the Philippines, it might be impossible to find adequate and/or early alternatives that would allow the Navy to respond as quickly to contingencies throughout the region. The Marianas have been suggested as one option, but they can only be considered a fall-back position, and would greatly increase the distance the fleet would be from probable areas of conflict and, therefore, lessen the time the U.S. Navy would have available to respond in times of crisis.

How the United States balances its need for continued access to Subic Bay with other foreign policy goals in the Philippines will thus be an extremely difficult policy problem for the Reagan administration to resolve.

The Subic facilities will be useless, of course, unless the Navy has the ships it needs to carry out all of its worldwide responsibilities. But, as mentioned earlier, the continuing deployment in the Indian Ocean demonstrates how overextended the U.S. Navy is at present. It is therefore difficult to conceive how American naval forces could, in the foreseeable future, respond effectively to simultaneous crises in the Indian Ocean and Pacific Asia. Thus, even in peacetime, the dispatch of forces to other areas has diluted the symbolic, supportive role the Navy plays in the Western Pacific.

HOW MUCH HELP FROM JAPAN?

The United States does not have to do the job alone, however, U.S. allies in the region can and must do more. Japan, in particular, can play a greater role in bolstering security in the Pacific.

Japan has, in fact, if somewhat belatedly, recognized the need to pay greater attention to military issues. At the end of December 1980 Tokyo announced it would increase its 1981 defense budget by 7.6%. While that increase is not as much as American officials want, it does represent a greater increase than was provided in the previous year's budget. Moreover, the summary of Japan's most recent White Paper on Defense demonstrates a new Japanese perspective, stating that "the White Paper is designed to include a description based upon the recognition that Japan must now consider her defense from a global perspective. . . . Because it was realized to be very important to grasp the situation in global scope, special chapters on military environments in the Middle East and Southeast Asia are included . . . for the first time this year."

There are, in naval terms, several tasks on which Japan could concentrate without violating its constitutional requirement to develop only defensive capabilities. If, for example, Japan would improve its maritime reconnaissance, build up its ASW capabilities, and take over the air defense of Japan itself, the end result would be a strengthening of U.S. forces in the region. Suffice it to say that the Japanese recognize these possibilities and are looking at a number of ways to improve their self-defense capacity in the areas stipulated.

Nevertheless, the question remains: Will Japan become more active in furthering the security of Pacific Asia? The answer depends to some extent on Japan's future relationship with the United States. At present, unfortunately—but understandably—the Japanese appear to retain a nagging fear, in the wake of the American debacle in Vietnam,

that the United States has little interest in Pacific security. That does not mean, however, that Japan itself will step in to play a more assertive role in maintaining peace in the region. On the contrary, it may make Tokyo more accommodating to prevalent security trends in the region. It is more likely that Japan will shoulder a greater defense burden if it is convinced it is doing so as a partner of the United States.

IMPROVED COMMUNICATIONS

Australia is another American ally in the region likely to play an increasingly important role in the years ahead. Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser has stated that "Australia [has] an interest in seeing that Soviet power in the Pacific and Southeast Asia is balanced by the power of other major states or by appropriate regional arrangements." That interest stems, of course, from Australia's strategic location, its vast resources and growing economy, and its own longtime commitment to democratic ideals.

Moreover, although Australian leaders recognize that their country will never be able to handle regional security threats on its own, they are planning major improvements in Australia's defense capabilities. Said improvements include: higher manpower expenditures; the selection of a new combat aircraft (either the F-16 or F-18); and modernization of facilities in the country's northern and western regions.

In addition, the Australian navy is undertaking the largest peacetime shipbuilding and base modernization program in the country's history. Moreover, Australia some time ago offered the United States the opportunity to develop a naval facility at Cockburn Sound on its west coast, and approved U.S. use of communication facilities at the North-West Cape.

Japan and Australia are only two of the Pacific Asian states improving their defense capabilities. Others are following suit. Indonesia, for example, is building up its navy through the acquisition of corvettes, fast attack craft, and submarines, and is also upgrading its air force and overhauling and re-outfitting existing army equipment.

Like Indonesia, Thailand is a member of ASEAN and could play an important role in maintaining regional security—as it probably should; Thailand is the country most immediately threatened by Vietnam's aggression and must also cope with the tragedy of the ever-swelling numbers of Vietnam refugees. Guerrilla activities in some sections of Thailand compound the difficulties facing Thai leaders.

Thailand's major priority is, and necessarily must be, dealing with the country's short-term problems. Over the longer term, however, Thailand could become a key player in regional affairs. Politically, it has participated with its ASEAN partners in coordinating successful diplomatic campaigns against Vietnam and marshaling international support for the ASEAN cause. As a member of ASEAN, Thailand is also linked to some of the region's most vibrant economies. Like Australia, its strategic location makes it a natural link between the Indian and Pacific basins—the same location gives it the potential for being the site of facilities that might offset Soviet access to Cam Ranh Bay.

But to be an effective regional actor Thailand must improve its military capabilities. Bangkok hopes to continue bolstering its forces with additional procurement of highly versatile aircraft as well as fast attack missile patrol boats. That will help, of course. But unless the United States increases its own capability for assisting Thai and other indigenous forces, it must face the consequences of inadequately protecting American interests.

That may be the most important fact of geopolitical life in the region for U.S. decisionmakers to learn. Because, like it or not,

none of the efforts of the other nations in the area can be truly effective without the continued presence of the United States in Asia. Only a major power can offset the adverse trends of recent years. The United States does not have to, and should not, work alone. It should, rather, ensure that its own efforts contribute to the development of a regional capability among friends and allies that will allow them to withstand pressures from potential adversaries.

The United States is a necessary but not all-sufficient component of the regional security system, informal as it may be. The U.S. Navy is a vital part of the American contribution to that system which, if it is to be effective and if U.S. goals in the area are to be achieved, must be given greater attention as a powerful and flexible policy instrument in the Pacific Asian region. ●

SELECTIONS TO FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD—SENATE RESOLUTION 209

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I should like to compliment my able colleague from Iowa, Senator ROGER JEPSEN, for his excellent initiative, Senate Resolution 209. This measure is both important and timely.

On January 31, 1981, Frederick Schultz' term as a Governor of the Federal Reserve System expires. At that time, President Reagan will be able to select a new Governor, S. Res. 209 asks the President, the Senate, and the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs to follow the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 in choosing a replacement.

The act states that not more than one Governor shall be selected from any one Federal Reserve district, and that due regard shall be given to a fair representation of financial, agricultural, and commercial interests as well as geographic divisions within the country. I regret to report we have strayed from the purpose of this act.

Agricultural interests have hardly received fair representation—of the 60 individuals who have been Governors since the Board's inception, only 7 of these have been from agricultural backgrounds and there has been no agricultural representation in the past 20 years. Only 23 individuals appointed since 1959 have had business experience, and only 1 of these was a small businessman.

The track record for the appointment of Governors from different geographic regions of the country has been equally poor. Each Governor is required to have some nexus with a different district, be it by virtue of birth, education or limited residence in a particular region of the United States.

If measured by the duration of their professional life spent in one region of the United States, over half of the individuals appointed to the Federal Reserve Board of Governors are from the east coast. Fewer than one-quarter are Midwesterners and a smaller number hail from the South.

During this time frame, only two Governors are from the West. Using a percentage of professional career as a measurement, the majority of Governors are from the East and were educated at ivy league colleges. While their contributions have been valuable, I think it is time to

establish some regional and occupational balance.

The policies of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors have had a dramatic impact on small businesses and farmers. These individuals cannot enter the marketplace and negotiate a loan at a rate below prime. They are the individuals who borrow at a few percentage points above the prime and desperately need short term capital.

I think it is important for the President to seriously consider nominating an individual to fill Governor Schultz' vacancy with an agricultural or small business background. To effectively communicate this message, I urge all of my colleagues to cosponsor this important measure. ●

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING ASSISTANCE

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate an impending crisis in the low-rent public housing program. This administration, in the name of economic recovery, is threatening to undermine this Nation's most significant housing resource for low-income people and a public investment that would cost \$75 billion to replace today. This simply does not make good sense, in either economic or human terms.

I would ask to submit for the RECORD an article from the New York Times of November 11, 1981. As this article points out, the budget figures put forward by this administration for public housing operating subsidies will force many housing authorities across the country to close down critically needed low-rent housing units.

Let me review for a moment the budget figures with which we are dealing. Public housing projects have been funded at only 85.5 percent of their funding system which has already been shown to be inadequate and to have systematically underfunded public housing projects over the years, particularly for the large urban housing authorities.

The continuing resolution for fiscal year 1982 contains a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1981 in the amount of \$148 million.

Despite the need for this supplemental as documented by the Department of Housing and Urban Development's own formula and figures, the administration is asking that this supplemental appropriation be deleted, and is refusing to distribute the funds provided in the continuing resolution. This cavalier attitude toward a critical housing resource for low-income people and a significant investment of public funds is totally irresponsible.

The budget figures for fiscal year 1982 are even more devastating. Despite a recognized need of \$1.5 billion for public housing operating subsidies, only \$1.205 billion has thus far been appropriated for fiscal year 1982, in accordance with the administration's original request.

This amount, according to the Department's estimates, will provide only 82 percent of required funding in the coming year.

However, these estimates appear over-

stated. The administration continues to attribute \$60 million in increased income to the 1982 estimates, based upon the recent legislated increase in the rent-to-income ratio.

Yet, information from housing authorities across the country is that the income from rent will not increase and will actually decrease. This is due not only to the startup time required in implementing the rental increase, but much more importantly, to the erosion of the income of public housing tenants which will result from the recent changes to welfare payments and other low-income assistance programs.

The National Association of Housing & Redevelopment Officials estimates that the \$1.205 billion will be adequate to fund housing authorities at a maximum of 79 percent of the documented need, and quite possibly less than that when actual income projections and utility rate increases are known.

Yet, the administration is requesting that these funds be reduced even further to a level of \$1.06 billion, an amount adequate to support and maintain our 1.2 million public housing units at a maximum of 69 percent of required need.

Mr. President, this situation cannot go unchallenged. Housing authorities have little recourse for dealing with cuts of this magnitude.

The persistent underfunding in recent years has reduced or eliminated housing authority reserve funds to the extent that there is no cushion to absorb any cuts. Over 44 percent of all public housing expenditures are spent on utilities, and this percentage is significantly higher for certain housing authorities, particularly in the Northeast.

Since housing authorities cannot turn off the heat or lights, they will be forced to again reduce basic services such as maintenance and security.

The housing authorities in my State experience a particular difficulty in adjusting to a reduction in operating assistance due to the high cost of utilities. For example, the Bridgeport Public Housing Authority must spend 56.8 percent of its total budget for utilities. The authority has depleted already all reserve funds and has reduced staff by 25 percent over the past 2 years. Utilities represent 50 percent of the operating budget for the Hartford Housing Authority.

Under a severe austerity program, this agency is not replacing staff and has reduced support for maintenance and resident services.

This is not just a minor belt-tightening that we are discussing. Housing authorities will be forced to take such drastic moves as eliminating all security services, confining maintenance activities to emergency repairs only, and closing units as they become vacant because there will be no resources to prepare them for new occupancy or to maintain them if they were occupied.

An internal HUD memorandum on the subject predicts cutoffs of utilities and other essential services, massive layoffs of personnel, possible labor strikes, unit closures, vandalism, rent strikes, litigation and displacement. Yet, still the administration ignores this crisis.

Mr. President, these policies will result in a totally dilapidated inventory of publicly owned housing, which no level of resources will be able to recapture.

Unless we act quickly and responsibly, we will have totally destroyed the shelter and living environments of over 3.5 million low-income citizens in this country.

We must reject economic policies that are shortsighted and without a shred of good business sense. I hope my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee and the full Senate will join me in attempting to deal with this crisis now.

The New York Times article follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 11, 1981]

HOUSING OFFICIALS FEAR HARM FROM CUTBACKS

(By Robert Pear)

WASHINGTON, Nov. 10.—Housing officials from around the country warned today that public housing units were falling into disrepair and would deteriorate rapidly because of reductions being made in Federal housing subsidies.

Their warnings were buttressed by internal documents from the Department of Housing and Urban Development that forecast the same consequences: "critical cash flow problems" for most public housing authorities, "cutoff of utilities and other essential services," layoffs of maintenance workers, rent strikes, litigation and the "closing down of large numbers" of public housing units.

Philip Abrams, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Housing, said the concerns were valid but overstated. With improved management and with larger contributions from state and local governments, he said, public housing authorities could continue operations at current levels.

President Reagan has proposed reductions in the level of Federal housing subsidies as part of his overall effort to control the growth in Government spending. Subsidies in the last fiscal year totaled \$962 million, or 85.5 percent of the amount for which local housing authorities were eligible under the established formula. For the current fiscal year, the Administration has requested \$1.06 billion in subsidies, representing 69 percent of the "reasonable" service level indicated by the formula.

At a news conference here, Robert Maffin, executive director of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, said:

"Local housing authorities are not crying wolf when they predict doom for public housing at the projected operating fund levels. Ninety thousand units of housing with a replacement value of \$6 billion are already seriously deteriorated and could be permanently lost from the nation's housing stock unless remedial measures are taken immediately."

The Federal Government provides operating subsidies for 1.2 million units of public housing with 3.4 million tenants.

John Simon, general manager of the New York City Housing Authority, the nation's largest, with 146,000 units, said the city was already deferring maintenance of lawns and shrubbery at public housing projects.

CONCERN IN NEW CITY

If further reductions are approved by Congress, he said, the housing authority will have to cut back on elevator repairs, janitorial services, building security and social programs for tenants. Vandalism will almost certainly increase, according to a written analysis prepared by the city agency, and public housing will then "begin to mirror closely the very slum buildings which are found surrounding the projects."

Several local housing officials said their problems were becoming so serious that they

might ask the Federal Government to take over management and operation of their projects. The housing authority in Jersey City has already inquired about the procedures for turning over its housing stock to the Federal Government.

Housing officials from Denver, San Francisco, Salt Lake City, Fort Worth, Milwaukee, New Orleans and Miami joined Mr. Maffin in warning that the proposed budget cuts, combined with the reductions already made, would seriously harm their operations. The Chicago Public Housing Authority has already experienced difficulty meeting its weekly payroll, Mr. Maffin said.

In a confidential memorandum to Philip D. Winn, the Federal Housing Commissioner, the staff of the Department of Housing and Urban Development said the proposed budget cuts "would result in nothing less than disaster for Boston and similar public housing authorities, probably forcing them to close down a substantial number of units."

The memorandum said the proposed cuts would "severely compromise the ability of public housing authorities to provide decent, safe and sanitary housing for low-income families" and would result in widespread vandalism. ●

THE TRIDENT

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, last week was a truly historic one for this country's nuclear submarine program. On Wednesday, November 11, the Nation's first Trident class nuclear powered fleet ballistic missile submarine, the U.S.S. *Ohio*, was commissioned as an operating unit of the U.S. Navy. Three days later, on Saturday, November 14, the Nation's third Trident submarine, the *Florida*, was christened and launched.

And, Mr. President, last week we also received the announcement that one of this Nation's most distinguished naval officers, Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, is retiring after nearly 60 years of service to his country. Admiral Rickover has played a critical role in the design and construction of the *Ohio*, as he has in all of our nuclear submarines. The country owes him a great debt.

The commissioning of the U.S.S. *Ohio* was an extraordinary moment in history when, as the first ship of its class, the *Ohio* became the largest, fastest, and quietest strategic submarine the Navy has ever had at sea. The *Ohio* represents a major modernization of the sea-based component of our strategic deterrent forces. It provides us with survivable and reliable nuclear forces, thus enhancing our own security and helping to insure peace.

The awesome size and strength of the U.S.S. *Ohio* are meant to deter all potential enemies from our country. It is my hope, and I am sure it is the hope of every American citizen, that the missiles aboard the Trident submarines never be used, that her full striking force never be felt, and the technological genius which created her and sent her to sea never be proven in time of war.

The *Ohio* and her sister ships have been designed and built by the workers of the electric boat division of the General Dynamics Corp. Seven years in the making—from initial design through construction to commissioning—the *Ohio* is an impressive achievement by the men and women who created her and proudly

delivered her to the U.S. Navy. In facilities in Groton, Conn., and Quonset Point, R.I., 25,000 workers produced the *Ohio* and the *Florida*, and are working on six other Trident submarines. Each ship is 560 feet long—almost two football fields in length—and each is an accomplishment worthy of national recognition.

Electric Boat will deliver six *Los Angeles* class attack submarines, and one Trident submarine, to the U.S. Navy this year. This is an exceptional record for a shipyard, and an especially important one today, when the need for U.S. naval strength has never been greater.

Mr. President, I attended the commissioning of the U.S.S. *Ohio* on November 11, Armistice Day: a day of peace, a day of reflection on the wars that have ravaged this country. The success of the Trident submarines will be measured by their preservation of peace, by their protection of our country's shores, and by their deterrence of aggression.

This Nation's submarines have been a crucial element in preserving peace for the last 30 years. It is the hope of the men and women who build them, of the naval officers and men who serve on them, and of all Americans, that the Trident class submarines will continue in this role for at least another 30 years.●

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS— THEY PAID THE PRICE FOR PEACE

● Mr. HAYAKAWA. Mr. President, history has shown that Americans have the ability to put the tragedies of their wars behind them. Dwelling on the past, even a victorious one, delays seeing accomplishments in the future. This inborn capability is progressive and has led America to great achievements. But, when putting the past behind us means forgetting the sacrifices of the brave men and women who fought so hard to assure our continued freedom, then a grave wrong is being committed.

In an article authored by Sherman Roodzant, National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans, for *Stars and Stripes*, this potential error is brought to our attention. Mr. Roodzant, a Vietnam-era veteran and a fellow Californian, emphasizes the importance of not forgetting our veterans, particularly the disabled. These brave soldiers sacrificed their blood for our freedom—we must not forget them when they need us most.

Last week I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 123 which proclaims the week of November 7 through November 13, 1982, "National Disabled Veterans Week." My resolution seeks to bring to our Nation's attention the contributions and sacrifices of its 2½ million disabled veterans. I look forward to its final passage so that my 35 cosponsors and I may begin preparations for an exciting and meaningful week. With the help of insightful articles such as Mr. Roodzant's, this Nation is reminded that, in the process of putting the trying times of war behind us, we must not forget the brave who fought to insure our freedom.

I believe Mr. Roodzant brings out some very important concerns of our disabled veterans, and I hope my colleagues will

take a moment to read his article. I ask that Mr. Roodzant's article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS—THEY PAID THE PRICE FOR PEACE

(By Sherman E. Roodzant)

The screams of the wounded and the stench of gunpowder surrounded Robert Richardson, a private in America's Continental Army, but he fought on until a British cannonball struck his hand spike. It broke in two, one end tearing his belly open. The wind from the cannonball left his right arm useless. Richardson's blood had paid the price of peace and freedom. But, for the rest of his life, he was totally disabled.

For a while, the Continental Congress provided the Revolutionary War veteran a disability pension of half his military salary. It helped, but Richardson was unable to support himself on this meager allowance. Even this pittance ended shortly after the War of Independence when the new national government turned responsibility for disabled veterans over to the individual states and their Poor Law systems.

Life was tough—really tough—for Richardson and other patriots wounded in the struggle for free America from colonial chains. Many were reduced to begging.

Things are better for the 2½ million disabled veterans living in today's America. But, on Veterans Day this year, it's appropriate to recall what happened to the disabled veterans of our Revolutionary War. What happened to them established a pattern that has, to some extent, been played out after each of our country's nine wars—a pattern of forgetfulness that's playing itself out again today, just six years after the last American was killed in Vietnam, our most recent war.

Perhaps that's understandable. When wars end, people want to get back to normal, to peacetime life, leaving the turmoil and anxiety of war behind. Following the Vietnam War—the most unpopular war in our nation's history with the single exception of the Civil War—the process of forgetting has been unusually rapid. People want to bury the bitter social division of the Vietnam years.

That's good, but there's a tragedy in the way we're going about it: When people forget about wars, they tend to forget about the sacrifices that veterans, particularly disabled veterans, have made. And when the public forgets the needs of disabled veterans, so do their elected representatives.

Maybe that's why the VA hospital system has been hit by one budget cut after another for the past five years, forcing the VA to turn thousands of eligible veterans away from the doors of its health care facilities.

Maybe that explains why job programs for disabled and Vietnam era veterans have been kept too small to make a serious dent in the employment problems these veterans have experienced.

Maybe that's why we've seen, for the first time this year, curtailments in GI Bill education programs.

Maybe that's the reason veterans' preference in Federal employment was attacked so viciously back in 1977 and 1978.

Maybe that's why the VA and other Federal agencies were so slow initially in recognizing the seriousness of such problems as the defoliant Agent Orange, the exposure of Cold War veterans to radiation in atomic weapons tests, and the post-traumatic stress difficulties of half a million or more Vietnam veterans.

Can it be that the American people have forgotten their warriors as they go about the process of forgetting the trying times of war? The 700,000 members of the Disabled American Veterans believe this is exactly what happened . . . not just after Vietnam, but after World War I, World War II, and the Korean War as well.

They are acutely aware that no veteran of any war should ever be forgotten. Without the sacrifices these men and women made, there would be no United States.

Back in 1903, Theodore Roosevelt said something that nearly every American would probably agree with. "A man who is good enough to shed his blood for his country is good enough to get a square deal afterward," he declared.

Looking at veterans' programs realistically, it's unlikely that our country would ever let the plight of its disabled veterans get as bad as it was for Private Richardson and his disabled comrades following the American Revolution. But it would be a mistake to simply assume, without giving it much thought, that all of our political leaders are bending over backward to make sure veterans—even disabled veterans—are getting the kind of "square deal" Roosevelt was talking about.

On Veterans Day, 1981, we must ask ourselves a very basic question. Can we do too much to guarantee a square deal for a sailor whose arms were crushed when a Nazi torpedo smashed through the hull of his ship . . . for the pilot whose body was burned and disfigured when his plane was shot down over Korea . . . for the Marine whose legs were blown off by a Viet Cong booby trap in the Mekong Delta . . . or for the World War I soldier who lost his sight in the Battle of the Marne?

Every American owes these people a debt that can never really be repaid.●

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have conferred with the minority leader in respect to the requests I am about to put to arrange the schedule of the Senate on tomorrow.

I now would like to put the requests.

First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until the hour of 10:30 a.m. on tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF CERTAIN SENATORS ON TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, the distinguished Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) then be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER DESIGNATING PERIOD FOR ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, after the time allocated to the two Senators under the special orders, there be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend past the hour of 11:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, under the previous order, is there not a provision for the Senate to go into executive session and for a vote at 11:30 on the

resolutions of ratification on nine treaties, one vote to count for nine votes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is correct.

ORDER TO RESUME CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4169

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of those treaties on tomorrow, the Senate return to legislative session and resume consideration of the State, Justice, Commerce appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 357

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the hour of 1 p.m. on tomorrow, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the continuing resolution making appropriations for various Departments and Agencies of Government, House Joint Resolution 357.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON HELMS AMENDMENT NO. 633

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I inquire of the Chair, was there an order entered earlier today for a vote on the Helms amendment to the State, Justice, Commerce appropriations bill to follow on immediately after the vote on the resolutions of ratification?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote was ordered in relation to the Helms amendment.

Mr. BAKER. The order has been entered for a vote on the Helms amendment after the vote on the resolutions of ratification, which begins at 11:30 a.m.?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, in relation to the Helms amendment.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I assume it is not necessary to amend my unanimous-consent order just previously entered to accommodate that order, but I now do so. It will read that at 11:30 a.m. the Senate will go into executive session for the purpose of considering the resolutions of ratification of nine treaties to be ratified by a single vote to count for nine votes. At the expiration of time for that rollover, under the order previously entered, the Senate will resume consideration of the State, Justice, Commerce

appropriations bill, and a vote in connection with the Helms amendment will occur at that time, without further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, then the balance of the order will read that after the disposition of the Helms amendment, the Senate will continue consideration of the State-Justice-Commerce appropriations bill until the hour of 1 o'clock.

Then I ask that the balance of my request be reiterated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Now, Mr. President, I see no other Senators seeking recognition. I will inquire of the minority leader if there is any further business to be transacted on his side.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I know of none.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10:30 A.M.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I know of no further business to come before the Senate. I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 10:30 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to and, at 7:20 p.m., the Senate recessed until Wednesday, November 18, 1981, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 17, 1981:

THE JUDICIARY

Alvin I. Krenzel, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Ohio, vice Don J. Young, retired.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 36, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Leon W. Babcock, Jr., XXX-X...
X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Robert D. Beckel, XXX-XX-XXXX
Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John A. Brashear, XXX-XX-XXXX
X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Duane H. Cassidy, XXX-XX-XXXX
X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. William M. Charles, Jr., XXX-X...
XXX-XX... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Joseph H. Connolly, XXX-XX-XXXX
X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Charles J. Cunningham, Jr., XX...
XXX-XX-XXXX Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Thomas G. Darling, XXX-X...
XXX-X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. William A. Gorton, XXX-X...
XXX-XX... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Monroe W. Hatch, Jr., XXX-X...
XXX-X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Paul H. Hodges, XXX-XX-XXXX X...
Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. William L. Kirk, XXX-XX-XXXX
X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Donald L. Lamberson, XXX-X...
XXX-X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Gerald D. Larson, XXX-XX-XXXX
X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. William J. Mall, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Charles McCausland, XXX-X...
XX... X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Robert E. Messerli, XXX-XX-XXXX
X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Joseph D. Moore, XXX-XX-XXXX
X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Richard D. Murray, XXX-X...
XX... X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. David L. Nichols, XXX-XX-XXXX
X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Peter W. Odgers, XXX-XX-XXXX
X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. George B. Powers, Jr., XXX-X...
XXX-XX... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Richard W. Pryor, XXX-XX-XXXX
X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Bernard P. Randolph, XXX-X...
XXX-X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Robert H. Reed, XXX-XX-XXXX X...
Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Thomas C. Richards, XXX-X...
XXX-X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Robert A. Rosenberg, XXX-X...
X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Robert D. Springer, XXX-XX...
X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Thomas S. Swalm, XXX-X...
X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. William E. Thurman, XXX-X...
X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Edward L. Tixier, XXX-X...
XX... X... Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Harold W. Todd, XXX-XX-XXXX X...
Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Kermit Q. Vandenbos, XXX-X...
X... Regular Air Force, Medical.
Brig. Gen. Brien D. Ward, XXX-XX-XXXX X...
Regular Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Clifton D. Wright, Jr., XXX-X...
X... Regular Air Force.